DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 322 937 JC 900 306

TITLE Applied Research Journal; Volume 1, Number 1, December 1986.
INSTITUTION Philadelphia Community Coll., Pa.
PUB DATE Dec 86
NOTE 83p.
PUB TYPE Collected Works - Serials (022) -- Viewpoints (120) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)
JOURNAL CIT Applied Research Journal; v1 n1 Dec 1986

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Curriculum; Community Colleges; *Curriculum Development; English (Second Language); Evaluation Methods; *General Education; Teaching Methods; Two Year Colleges; Writing Improvement; *Writing Instruction; Writing Skills

ABSTRACT

Five articles by faculty members from the Community College of Philadelphia are presented in this journal issue. "Reconstructing the Academic Environment: A Proposal for the Revision of the General Studies Curriculum," by Martin B. Spear and Dennis McGrath, offers a conceptual foundation for decision making in curriculum development for general studies. "Reflections upon the Deliberative Process among Several Academic Administrators in Reconceptualizing the General Studies Curriculum," by William Baker, describes and assesses a major decision-making effort concerning the college's general studies program. "What Is the Vision That Guides the Curriculum Development in a Community College?" by Karen R. Schermerhorn, focuses on the relationship of faculty to curriculum, the influence of student choice on curriculum, and the challenge of overcoming environmental obstacles to the goal of faculty-directed curricular initiatives. "Using Readers' Assessment of Student Essays to Determine Improvement in Writing Abilities under Two Treatment Conditions," by Aram L. Terzian, provides an initial evaluation of a curricular redesign effort funded by the Ford Foundation. Finally, "Facilitating Input Comprehension for Second Language Development and Academic Achievement in Transitional College Courses for English-as-a-Second-Language Students," by Susana Sotillo, reports on research to identify effective instructional approaches for non-native speakers of English. (EJV)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED322937

APPLIED RESEARCH JOURNAL

Volume 1, Number 1

December, 1986

IC 900 306

COMMUNITY COLLEGE OF PHILADELPHIA

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Eaton

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

X Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

1700 Spring Garden Street, Philadelphia, PA 19130

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPLIED RESEARCH JOURNAL

RESEARCH REVIEW PANEL

Elaine Atkins
William Baker
Fay Beauchamp
Anthony Bruno
Judith Eaton
Ralph Faris
Barry Grossbach
Jane Grosset
Tom Hawk
Andrea Mengel

EDITORIAL/PRODUCTION STAFF

Denise Ahern
Joe Bendig
Laurie Lindsay

COVER DESIGN

Gary Grissom

Community College of Philadelphia

From the Review Panel...

The Research Review Panel of the Applied Research Institute is pleased to bring you this first set of important articles from contributing members of the Community College of Philadelphia faculty and administration. The Panel's work for this issue involved determining a purpose for the Applied Research Journal, reviewing proposals for contribution, and soliciting contributions. In essence, we have served as an editorial board.

Our first year has been one of development and exploration. While this issue reflects the general statement of purpose with which we began, we are moving to a further refinement of that statement. This will be reflected in subsequent issues of the Journal which will incorporate a significant additional emphasis on theoretical approaches to fundamental community college issues.

It has been our pleasure to serve at this early and important stage of the development of this publication.

Elaine Atkins
William Baker
Fay Beauchamp
Anthony Bruno
Judith Eaton
Ralph Faris
Barry Grossbach
Jane Grosset
Tom Hawk
Andrea Mengel

CONTENTS

Introduction iii

Reconstructing the Academic Environment: A Proposal for the Revision of the General Studies Curriculum 1
Martin B. Spear, Dennis McGrath

Reflections Upon the Deliberative Process Among Several Academic Administrators in Reconceptualizing the General Studies Curriculum 15
William Baker

What Is the Vision That Guides the Curriculum Development in a Community College? 31
Karen R. Schermerhorn

Using Readers' Assessment of Student Essays to Determine Improvement in Writing Abilities Under Two Treatment Conditions 53
Aram L. Terzian

Facilitating Input Comprehension for Second Language Development and Academic Achievement in Transitional College Courses for English-As-A-Second-Language Students 69
Susana Sotillo

Introduction

This inaugural issue of the Applied Research Journal signals Community College of Philadelphia's commitment to examination of important educational issues, sharing of meaningful research, and encouragement of creativity in teaching and learning. The document will be available to all staff within the institution as well as to select leaders in higher education throughout the country. We hope to ensure annual and perhaps semi-annual publication.

The contributors to this first issue are reflective of the diversity of institutional interests and talents. Deans William Baker (Humanities and Applied Arts) and Aram Terzian (Social and Behavioral Sciences) review the effectiveness of institutional undertakings from an administrative perspective. Mr. Baker describes and assesses a major decision-making effort concerning the College's General Studies program; Dr. Terzian provides initial evaluation of an important curricular redesign effort funded by the Ford Foundation. Professors Karen Schermerhorn (English), Fay Beauchamp (English), Ron Feinstein (Mental Health), Susan Sherman (Nursing), Martin Spear (Philosophy), and Elaine Atkins (English) undertake a significant and provocative discussion concerning the relationship of faculty to curriculum, the influence of student choice on curriculum, and the challenge of overcoming environmental obstacles to the goal of faculty-directed curricular initiatives balanced by sensitivity to student interest and choice. Dr. Susana Sotillo (Bilingual/ESL Programs) reports on research in progress to identify effective instructional approaches for non-native speakers of English. Professor Martin Spear joins with Professor Dennis McGrath (Sociology) in an ambitious effort to formulate a conceptual foundation for decision-making in general studies.

There are many acronyms used within the publication which may provide some difficulty for those outside the institution. They are:

(1) TOP: The Transfer Opportunity Program funded by the Ford Foundation. A three-year grant to design humanities and social science curriculum along interdisciplinary lines placing major emphasis on language skill development;

(2) Project II: A three-tiered, pre-collegiate program characterized by efforts to integrate various curricular areas. A commitment to the notion that basic skill improvement requires a substantive context and collaborative efforts by various faculty;

(3) ESL: English as a Second Language. The College's efforts to ensure adequate language instruction to those who are non-native English speakers;

(4) General Studies: An Associate Degree curriculum at Community College of Philadelphia which has undergone a major critical analysis and for which a major action initiative is being developed.

This volume underscores the shared responsibility of faculty and administrators in the creation of an effective and creative learning environment. We seek quality; we seek excitement; we seek results. It is our view that as professionals working together we can indeed provide an exciting and meaningful response to the dramatic educational needs of the city we serve.

RECONSTRUCTING THE ACADEMIC ENVIRONMENT: PROPOSAL FOR THE REVISION OF THE GENERAL STUDIES CURRICULUM

MARTIN B. SPEAR
DENNIS McGRATH

INTRODUCTION

Associate in General Studies degree programs at community colleges have been many things to many people. Their phenomenal growth during the last decade or so may be reflective of the perceived inadequacy or inappropriateness of more traditional, more rigorously structured curricula. Students have used General Studies programs in at least the following ways: 1) as a base for construction of their own transfer curricula which "parallel" those of selected four-year colleges; 2) as a "holding" curriculum which can parallel a particular career curriculum; 3) as a catch-all device which allows students to select specific interest courses without the constraints of curricula; 4) as a vehicle for exploration of diverse interests and/or the accumulation of transfer credit. Each of these is an intelligent and legitimate way for students to use the opportunities offered by the community college. However, this wide variety of uses and users has placed enormous strain on what meager coherence exists in the typical General Studies curriculum.

A system that essentially allows students to decide for themselves what makes sense educationally constitutes a fundamental challenge to traditional understanding of a college as engaged in a common educational enterprise. Colleges have become torn by the struggle between legitimate but competing values: the maximization of student choice and opportunity collides with curricular power and coherence and with the faculty's sense of professional responsibility to judge and mandate courses of study for students whose understanding of such matters cannot be assumed to be keen. Thus, an examination of the General Studies curriculum thrusts us into the central policy debate facing community colleges today. From the initiating conception of community colleges which stressed

Applied Research Journal
Community College of Philadelphia
Vol. 1, No. 1, 1986
©Community College of Philadelphia

access, education for work, individual student choice, and the right to fail, colleges have begun to move to a new view which emphasizes education for life, the value of programmatic coherence, and the need to balance access with equity and excellence.[1]

If community colleges are to seriously attempt to reduce student failure, expand their sense of educational and career options, and restrict the indiscriminate course-taking associated with the emphasis on student choice, they must formulate a new educational vision to guide the reflective reconstruction of the academic environment. We must confront the extent to which the academic culture of community colleges has been reshaped by the expansion of General Studies. The fragmentation of the curriculum that reaches its apogee in General Studies is the curricular analogue of the isolation of individual faculty members whose professional careers consist of the teaching, reteaching, and redoing of the same introductory level courses to classes in which heterogeneity in ability and preparation is very marked. Stampeding burnout, the honing of eccentricity, and the compounding of fragmentation and incoherence of students' educational experience is the predictable and only too familiar result.

The tremendous surge in the growth of the General Studies curriculum, with its vision of students piecing together their college experience, has been largely fueled by the growth in the part-time student population. For these now-typical community college students, General Studies presents itself seductively as extremely flexible and convenient. With few exceptions, almost any courses can be taken at any time, in any order, pretty much at the discretion of the student. General Studies has thus been attractive to administrators since it has been perceived to be essential to maintenance of enrollment levels. However, it is becoming increasingly clear that enrollment is purchased at a very high price for students and for colleges. General Studies characteristically shows very high attrition compared to more tightly structured curricula. As the curriculum of choice it has facilitated the virtual disappearance of the 200-level course and the emergence of a cafeteria style registration procedure. For part-time General Studies students particularly, the college is a place for occasional course-taking—there is no rational sequence of activities, no markers in their student careers, no real involvement in a learning community which might hold them long enough to make a real impact on their lives. The standard response of colleges to the upsurge in the non-traditional, part-time student population is to expand and redesign its student services, especially counseling and advising. But if colleges are to successfully transform themselves into effective institutions for the population they serve, it must be recognized that students' primary involvement with college is through the curriculum and in the classroom. If these students are to be adequately addressed, curricular and pedagogical strategies—our courses and teaching techniques—must be dramatically rethought.

The General Studies curriculum at Community College of Philadelphia (CCP) is an excellent illustration of the ways in which colleges have become reshaped over the past 20 years. Permitting almost anything and mandating almost nothing, it can hardly be called a curricular structure at all, but is rather a kind of institutional container for many different types of students either constructing their own courses of study or wandering without direction. The academic audit of the curriculum (1984) identified five distinct types of students each presenting us with a different educational challenge.

1. Goal-Directed, Career-Oriented Students. These students, who make up about 19% of the total, are described as having sufficient academic abilities to succeed in college

courses without unusual support services. Their pattern of course-taking reflects a strong desire to gain specific job-related skills, although they may or may not be oriented toward a degree. They are unlikely to take liberal arts courses in depth. The educational challenge with these students is to construct a program which permits them to develop the vocational skills they want while providing a more powerful general education experience. While they are generally meeting their self-defined goals, we must work to expand their sense of college and career options, while ensuring that they acquire a reasonable mix of technical and generic competencies.

2. Goal-Directed, Academically Able, Transfer-Oriented Students. Comprising about 20%, these students are similar to those in the first category, except that they are explicitly transfer-oriented. The task here is to provide transfer-oriented students with a strong and coherent general education experience which effectively and realistically prepares them for upper division work at a four-year college or university while also enhancing their educational and career exploration.

3. Options-Exploring, Academically Able Students. These make up 25% of the total enrollment and, like the next group, illustrate some of the major problems with the current curriculum. They enter the college with the academic ability to successfully complete their studies, but their pattern of course-taking is varied and incoherent; they are ambivalent about their degree and career goals, and they have high rates of course withdrawal and of dropping out of the college. The educational challenge for this group is to construct a curricular experience, coupled with supporting counseling and mentoring activities, which helps them see meaning and coherence in their collegiate lives and develop mature and informed career plans.

4. Unclear Goals, Academically Floundering Students. These students, also about 25%, tend to begin college with academic skills that are marginally adequate and have strong ambivalences about their educational goals. Like the previous group, they exhibit erratic and inappropriate patterns of course selection, high rates of withdrawal and low grades. The challenge here is the same as with the prior group, to couple curricular structures with supporting activities to provide coherent and meaningful experiences.

5. Aspiring Selective Program Students. Students in this category hope to be admitted into a competitive admissions program at CCP or elsewhere. They tend to have either poor high school records or lack a background in math and science. They usually take courses required for a particular program, "paralleling it," but are often forced to repeat those courses and have a low probability of successful admission into the program of their choice. The task with this group is to design educational settings which enhance both their academic and their career exploration while dramatically improving the generic academic competencies needed for success in selective technical programs.

In what follows we will attempt to sketch a way to think about General Studies revision. The college will decide through its institutional structures and its political procedures precisely what the details of that curriculum will look like. What we are trying, however, is to influence the terms of that debate, what models of curriculum development will guide the conversation, what language of curriculum and education we will speak, and what is to be the representation of the professional and intellectual community that the curriculum will embody.

GENERAL STUDIES AS GENERAL EDUCATION

Perhaps the most difficult part of the rethinking of the General Studies curriculum is freeing ourselves from the standard image of curriculum construction that dominates our conversation and which continually frustrates our efforts. On that model, curriculum development seems to be a matter of developing activities which bring students from point A to point B, given that incoming students are known or assumed to have such and such characteristics (be these cognitive, social, moral, or what). This fascination with seeing education as a technology, in thinking of educators as absorbed by a technical problem, generates much of the apparatus of entry and exit testing, creates the vocabulary of goals and objectives, and leads us to believe we must negotiate between the hard scientific facts culled from educational psychology and the "values" of the educated community. Within that model the movement for General Studies reform is repeatedly blocked. The diversity of our students is so well known; there is such extraordinary difficulty in saying anything about them as a group which is both true and interesting; any curricular scheme that demands substantive homogeneity in its beginning population is sure to be inadequate. But the curious institutional paralysis about General Studies is more importantly a matter of the multiple ways the curriculum is used. Put in terms of the canonical model, its fundamental problem is the formulation of goals and objectives, of outcomes. One might say that a curriculum that is not designed to bring students to anywhere in particular can hardly recommend any particular way to bring them there.

If the standard model of curriculum construction fares so poorly with General Studies curricula, then how are we to think of them at all? Explanations and justifications of such curricula typically come in two forms. First, that General Studies is an historical accident, that it is just an institutional device for matriculating students, that it is an "exit" curriculum. Secondly, General Studies is guided by an insistence on the maximization of student opportunity and student choice. These two accounts each implicitly deny that General Studies either does or ought to express any theoretical or educational vision. On the contrary, we believe that the most fruitful answer is that General Studies is the curricular analogue of General Education—that General Studies expresses our collegiate understanding of General Education.

Now, it may be thought that understanding General Studies in terms of General Education is to make no advance given the long-standing disputes, controversies and confusions that General Education has engendered. The notion itself is borrowed from the elite universities whose struggles with it for almost a century have expressed the deep divisions within and concerns about the contemporary trajectory of curricula. The tension which continues to be felt is between the developing need for specialization as found in the professionalization of disciplines and the older republican and religious conceptions of education which are guided by the ideal of an educated citizen. Thus, the increasing marginalization of the Liberal Arts, particularly the Humanities, within the public sphere during this century, has been accompanied by the progressive fragmentation and privatization of our professional and our civic culture. Whether the great universities, through their debates over General Education, can produce technically competent but publicly involved citizens is uncertain and problematic. For our purposes, though, it is enough to realize that the vocabulary of General Education reform that has developed at the universities is an inappropriate and misleading guide to the task facing community college educators.

Drawing on this distinctive university heritage, conversations about General Education amble along familiar paths. The first of these conceives General Education in terms of a common fund of knowledge, ensemble of skills, competencies, and attitudes that every educated person must have. Not untypically, those are talked of as Secretary of Education William Bennett talks of them—as if we are educating nineteenth-century English gentlemen. More significantly, this path seductively introduces the suggestion that we can talk of persons as "generally educated" when they have read such and such books, and perhaps think and feel what is standardly thought and felt. Objections to that line unfortunately usually take the form of substituting a left wing canon for a right wing one, and liberal ideals for conservative ones. Even at community colleges, where the utter futility of such a view is vicerally felt, the implicit orientation of General Education as an achievement remains. So we are treated to debates about what it means, for our students, to be "generally educated." And, not surprisingly, we hear that students need to be "exposed" to art, literature, and philosophy so that some number, long remembered in fond anecdote, may be "turned on" to education.

On the contrary, we argue that the very fragmentation of our civic culture that raised the problem of General Education at the universities renders implausible any attempt to conceive it substantively. Here the worry from the left becomes critical. Unless some relatively narrow community is to be the arbiter of what counts as being generally educated, it is simply false that there is any common body of knowledge, ensemble of skills, attitudes and competencies that commands wide assent.

The second influential account of General Education is the sort formulated by Boyer and Levine in *A Quest for Common Learning.*[2] On this line, the fragmentation of the intellectual world which has the specialized curriculum as its educational expression calls for efforts at holistic integration. Interdisciplinary curricula which have as their focus the relations among discrete disciplines, the supposed unity of the intellectual field, and, in particular, the universal features of human experience are characteristically recommended by proponents of this analysis of General Education.

But, in our view, this account conflates two very different problems by failing to notice the ambiguity in the notion of "common learning." On the one hand, it may be "learning that all people have in common." Or it may come to "learning what all people have in common." Of course, the first of these is something like Bennett's view, and Adler's, whereas the second far more problematic line is what generates the vast multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary edifices that one can find in many curricula. Ironically, such study of the "common," or what is taken to be common, just adds one more voice to the institutional cacophany that it is designed to remedy.

The third familiar line about General Education would read the solution right from the problem. If students are becoming overly specialized by concentrating more and more of their time in progressively narrower disciplines, then the movement toward General Education can be seen as an attempt to add breadth to a curriculum that already has plenty of depth. Those breadth components may possibly take the forms suggested by Bennett or Boyer, but the call to de-specialize, by itself, leaves open the possibility that a simple credit distribution system, already in place at more than 90% of all four-year colleges, will be enough. When a solution like credit juggling is so seductively available, there is naturally little likelihood that very profound reflection about fundamental pedagogical forms and strategies will be supported. So a credit distribution system is interested in

merely broadening students, in contrast to the first two approaches which insist that the broadening specifically proceed through the creation or recreation of what has been perceived to be lost or never really had, a common culture of educated people.

For our purposes, what is important to notice about General Education is that, whatever else may be said, it is always taken to counter a fundamentally fragmented curriculum which is expressive of a fragmented and disordered civic and intellectual culture. Put somewhat differently, particular curricular forms are not neutral to fundamental intellectual concerns. Each makes concrete an abstract understanding of the culture of the mind, however coherent or fragmented, and its place in our public life. Of course, the battle over General Education can be waged at various levels of abstraction. But what is most fundamentally at stake is how we are to understand each other. That worry can be addressed by insisting on a common fund of cultural references (as in Bennett), by inventing a humane scientific understanding of ourselves and others (Boyer), or by devising ways for our differences to be understood and rationally and humanely negotiated. Not to make light of the others, but we believe that the last of these understandings provides the key to rethinking General Education and General Studies at our college.

For community college students in General Studies curricula, (particularly those "floundering"), the educational challenge confronting curriculum designers is very different from either technical education or the university model of general education which seeks to broaden and de-specialize students. This challenge is the structural disarticulation between faculty and students produced by the overwhelming success of the mission of open access institutions, which has seen the enrollment of millions of students who previously would never have attended college.[3] Students, of course, have always varied in their degree of acceptance of faculty values, cognitive styles and modes of analysis. But until the massive expansion of higher education in the 1960's, students and faculty shared roughly the same cultural world. The historic surge in enrollment that undergirded the growth of the community college severed that normal expectation. The new student is "non-traditional" not only in the sense of being a first-generation college-goer but also in the much more profound sense of lacking the traditional ensemble of skills, values and knowledge assumed of earlier generations of students. None of the prevalent educational dogmas adequately appreciate this problem and all obscure the potential of a reformulated General Education program to cope with it. Thus, we must recognize that while there has been much productive innovation in two-year institutions, it has not occurred in the core curriculum. We have pioneered in providing classes at neighborhood sites; we have experimented with alternative "modes of delivery"; we have provided extensive support services; we have been creative in dealing with the crushing problem of remedial education. However, we have never made fundamental adjustments in the way General Education is conceived and conducted which would reveal that we understood the nature of the task for the non-traditional student.

Through the distribution requirements of our General Education program, we offer students a scaled-down version of what is offered at elite four-year colleges even though we know that the difference between those students and ours is not that they have scaled-down intelligence. Instead, most students at elite colleges, at least traditionally, understand academic and professional life. They have read about and can talk about intellectual matters and have done so for years. They share, in other words, the attitudes, patterns of thinking and modes of behavior which put them on a professional track and

permit them to enter into intellectual life at a reasonably sophisticated level. Our students, especially General Studies students, are not similarly prepared. They have little in their experience that models intellectual or professional life. They do not take themselves seriously as learners of something worth learning, but rather view themselves as engaged in a kind of certification process. Frequently they come from backgrounds that do not value controversy and debate, so they back away from rational discourse into an easy relativism. Many have little sense of controlling their lives, frequently seeing themselves as acted upon rather than acting, as having little control of resources that might alter their socio-economic destiny. They have trouble evaluating where they are relative to their goals, what sorts of changes in themselves would be required to achieve them, or even what it would mean to achieve them.

For students such as these, General Education is really the critical component of an education that requires a profound process of transformation, of initiation into academic and professional communities with their characteristic modes of understanding and dispositions toward learning and rational inquiry. The progressive initiation into various academic disciplines understood as discourse communities minimally involves the ability to conduct oneself within those communities, to deploy appropriately its models, theories, methods and vocabulary, to understand oneself as an operator within one of many such discourse communities, and the ability to tack between communities. Thus, General Education is, or ought to be, the fundamental communication between the college faculty and the student body concerning their understanding of intellectual life.[4]

The most influential models of student development such as those of Perry and Chickering are based on psychological theories of personal growth.[5] Students are usually portrayed as passing through a series of stages as they progress through the life course. However, it may be more useful to conceive student development in social terms and to develop a social theory of the non-traditional student experience. On this view, a student's academic career can be understood as a series of initiations into various intellectual communities, each with its own norms of discourse and analysis, special vocabulary and set of important questions. Each time a student takes an introductory course, be it in biology, economics or some other discipline, he or she in effect enters a new intellectual community, represented by the pedagogy, assignments and texts utilized by the instructor. A successful college experience rests on the ability of students to puzzle out what is different about various courses, to enter into these disciplinary cultures and to gain some sense of what it means to work as a biologist rather than a historian or psychologist.

The normal collegiate experience of moving among diverse discourse communities presents a severe challenge for non-traditional students who are least familiar with the culture and practices of academic life. Their preparation for successful college careers requires that we improve their ability to enter the multiple intellectual worlds that comprise academic life, that we provide "bridges of understanding" along which they may move from non-traditional backgrounds to competent membership in the educated community, that we explicitly signal that initiation into academic life requires the ability to engage in the practices of that life, to argue, analyze and talk in certain ways, to take certain questions seriously, to find ways to articulate and resolve differences in interpretations. Put another way, students must come to see disciplines as complex cultures actively created and carried on by their members rather than as compilations of facts strung together by discrete concepts.

Rethinking a General Education program that is appropriate for a community college means undergoing a gestalt shift. The canonical, incrementalist picture of curriculum construction needs to be replaced by the organic understanding of the community of disclosure. The vocabulary of goals and objectives, of sequenced skills which somehow have an educated person coming out the far side must give way to a vocabulary of forms of life, of cognitive styles, of models and theories. The cherished liberal language of values clarification must be grounded in the habits and practices of our college as a discourse community. In short, thinking of General Education as expressive of our deepest commitments as intellectuals and our fondest hopes for our students, means understanding that the curricular forms and pedagogical practices currently in place are the institutional expression of certain standard, unreflective ways of talking and thinking about our students, their abilities, and their prospects.

THE META-CURRICULUM

Even at a traditional four-year college or elite university, the call for the curriculum to express the communal understandings of the nature of intellectual life would be confronted by the historic fact which has generated the whole General Education movement: in this century the intellectual world, as indeed the civic culture itself, has disintegrated into contending, mutually uncomprehending sects.[6] At our own college, as in many community colleges, that is complicated by our self-understanding as a teaching institution in which faculty become increasingly inventive as teachers while increasingly isolated from their disciplinary concerns. While the focus on pedagogy has insulated us from intellectual fashions, it has also meant that individual teachers, departments and divisions have become more and more intellectually isolated, more and more unself-conscious as to the picture of the intellectual and professional world that is represented to our students. In a perfectly typical community college cacophony the last decade has seen the rapid proliferation of special programs and services, curricula, courses, and pedagogies. We contend that at a college which has such a diverse sense of what it is about, General Education would consist in a program that ably expresses each of the major competing representations of intellectual activity, what we call "educational agendas," to the students. A General Studies program, the curricular manifestation of our General Education understandings, would be organized into "dimensions" in which a student would pass through consistent and sustained activities that were explicitly designed to express specific educational agendas. Our reflective task is to decide as a college which dimensions are most critical for students, and most representative of the educated and professional community into which they will move.

A General Studies program shaped according to a weighting of the various legitimate educational agendas of the faculty in a differentiated core structure would explicitly initiate students into the intellectual community as it actually exists at the college and prepare them for the pluralism of the academic and professional world. Each dimension of the curriculum would be designed to express a particular intellectual agenda and the pedagogical practices, assignments, readings and associated informal activities would all be organized to initiate students into that representation of intellectual life. Students moving along the dimensions of the curriculum would engage in the major representations of intellectual activity which exist at the college. More importantly, they would do so in a self-conscious way, ultimately recognizing when they are working in one intellectual style rather than another.

General Studies reformulation along these lines demands sober recognition of both the unity and the multiplicity of the task—that movement in any one dimension requires careful, consistent and sustained attention of pedagogy and that we as a college are committed to the fundamental importance of several such dimensions. Departments and divisions represent fundamentally different orientations. Sometimes even within departments faculty understandings as to what they are about with their students are dramatically different and even opposed. Construction of a college-wide curriculum that represents the diversity of the college and the educated world requires that we come to terms with our own diversity, that we use it thoughtfully to initiate our students into the discourse communities in which they must move. Thus, the effort to reform curriculum, if it is to be successful, must be accompanied by significant and sustained staff development activities, the aim of which is to reconstruct the collegiate community out of individual faculty members, departments and divisions.

Such a reconstruction of the college is a delicate task and requires that we fully appreciate the extent and the kinds of the diversity which resulted from the relatively isolated and uncoordinated experimentation of faculty. Each of the different "agendas" which are pedagogically represented among our faculty we hold to be legitimate and suggest that the problem of General Studies reform is ultimately that of finding ways to successfully incorporate these agendas into the curriculum in powerful and coherent ways. In what follows we attempt to describe the major intellectual agendas we find in place at the college which might reasonably form the basis for a dimensional reformulation of General Studies. In this description we try to give an abstract rendering of the intellectual world as implicitly pictured in certain pedagogies and expressed in associated vocabularies with which we are all familiar, recognizing that any particular classroom or program is very likely to have mixed commitments.

1) The Critical Literacy Agenda. This agenda is represented by the Transfer Opportunities Program and the FIS: Honors Program, although obviously it has its purveyors elsewhere as well. On this line the central achievement to be worked for with students is competency with language as expressed in sophisticated forms of writing and reading. The construction and deconstruction of texts understood as rhetorical documents situated in a network of discourse is the distinguishing pedagogical style. Further, this agenda can be seen as a pedagogical twist on the more familiar "Critical/Analytic" agenda. Many faculty see the hallmark of an educated person to be the ability to adopt a critical stance toward conventionally held opinions and form independent judgments in matters of controversy and consequence. Besides the crucial matter of the development of an appropriate self-conception relative to others in the discourse community, this requires the cultivation of formidable analytic abilities which allow the student both to unpack implicit argumentative and explanatory structures and to appreciate and weigh fundamental alternatives.

2) The Cultural Literacy Agenda. This agenda, in which the student's need is conceived primarily in informational terms, is strongly represented among the liberal arts faculty. Obviously lacking in anything like the traditional informational repertoire, students are talked about as needing "exposure" to the humanities, the social sciences and so on. Even sophisticated interdisciplinary courses and programs such as the FIS: Honors Program have powerful commitments of this sort. The so-called connections and relations among disciplines or between social/political history and literary artifacts may be just higher level, more complex information. The distinguishing pedagogy of this

agenda is the lecture/discussion. There may be a reliance on textbooks, but even primary sources if used unproblematically will carry this agenda.

3) The Personal/Artistic Development Agenda. Although not represented so strongly programatically as others, this agenda nevertheless has forceful advocates and practitioners. On this conception the nurturing of students' artistic and performance capabilities is considered to be integral to their personal, moral, and social growth and as a remedy for the traditional impoverished educational obsession with information acquisition and cognition. Expressive or creative writing, overriding concern with the cultivation of a distinctive voice, reliance on the category of "insight" for evaluation, and goals which suggest that students will become their own philosophers or poets are staples of this agenda.

4) The Skills Agenda. Especially well represented among composition and mathematics faculty is the notion that at least some "basic skills" are indispensable for our students, although of course, philosophy faculty may take themselves to be teaching skills in argumentation, science faculty skills in the laboratory and so on. The vocabulary of "skills" is so widespread, and the skill level of our students is so universally perceived as dismal, that it is almost impossible to have any conversation about any agenda without this one creeping in. Its distinguishing feature is the conception that complex and sophisticated intellectual achievements can be broken down into simpler discrete achievements which are taken to be necessarily both logically and temporally prior to the more complex. Pedagogy relies very heavily on repetition and drill, practice with "problems," and memorization of rules.

5) The Vocational Agenda. Almost all of our students are here for the reason that they think there is some relation between "education" and advancement. Many programs and courses purport to be offering certification that will allow movement up a career ladder. Although a traditional function of college has been to allow students the opportunity to explore varied educational and career interests, to discover what it really means to be a this or a that, the guiding conceptions of the Vocational agenda are rather: 1) movement along previously selected career paths; 2) acquisition of "entry level" skills; and 3) development and deployment of appropriate personal and professional styles and competencies. An interesting feature of this agenda is the difficulty in engaging in real conversation with its purveyors, who typically insist that certifying agencies and market pressures preclude any real reconsideration of curricula.

6) The Scientific/Technological Literacy Agenda. Advocates of this agenda hold that the most pervasive and most powerful intellectual style of the modern world is that associated with the natural sciences and technologies. Whatever the disputes, and there have been many, about the nature of science and the "scientific method," it is clear that the scientific tradition provides the model by which reasoning is standardly assessed and policy formulated. No one can reasonably be thought to enter the kinds of conversation demanded of an informed citizen without some understanding of what the self-characterization of science and technology comes to.

7) The Counseling/Mentoring Agenda. Although the College generally recognizes a very strong distinction between the academic function and the student service function, many faculty and counselors see themselves as engaged in what is routinely, albeit

somewhat vaguely, characterized as "mentoring." Roughly, the notion is that students need to become much more reflective about their own abilities, life situations and prospects and much more competent personal career managers if they are to have hope of achieving their goals. At present this agenda is represented by two very different sets of practices. On the traditional understanding, students meet with counselors and mentors with whom they develop personal ongoing professional/client relations in which the professional guides and advises the student. An alternative model was pioneered in the Counseling/Mentoring seminars of the TOP and FIS: Honors programs. The guiding conception here is that the teaching faculty deploy dialogic, interpersonal, and interpretive skills in a small group seminar setting in an effort to disclose to the student community the various patterns of student understanding of personal and professional life. The Counseling staff operates primarily in a consultative capacity, cooperating with the teaching faculty, troubleshooting, and sharing in the development of the materials, practices and processes of each seminar. Linking critical literacy activities with mentoring is a powerful counter to the traditional split between the narrowly conceived academic orientation of teaching and the standard conception of counseling as a "student service."

THE CURRICULUM

The General Studies curriculum will consist of 63 credit hours distributed as follows:

* Student must satisfy the 12 hour requirement for the dimensions:

    1) Skills Development
    2) Critical Literacy
    3) Sci/Tech Literacy

* Student must satisfy the 12 hour requirement for two of the dimensions:

    4) Cultural Literacy
    5) Personal Artistic Development
    6) Vocational Exploration

* Student must satisfy the 3 hour requirement for the dimension:

    7) Counseling/Mentoring

As a process for the development and implementation of this curriculum we propose the following:

A) that the college decide through appropriate mechanisms which of the many agendas will be represented in the curriculum and in what proportion.

B) that the faculty be invited to submit proposals for activities, courses, sequences, and clusters of courses, which would contribute to the satisfaction of specified dimensions of the curriculum, indicating specifically by which pedagogical processes the agenda will be primarily represented.

C) that the college institute staff and curricular development activities to assist staff in the development of coherent sequences of activities to satisfy the various dimensions as

well as assist non-teaching faculty and staff to work within the new curricular framework. Further, that the college seek outside funding to provide the resources for the large staff development effort.

D) that the college adopt registration and advisement policies that permit student construction of their own curriculum only with special permission.

COMMENTARY

These requirements are designed to supplement, not replace, those already in place in General Studies and hence not dramatically alter student flows. Social science courses, for instance, depending on how they are taught, might easily be taken to satisfy the Sci/Tech dimension, as might courses in the history of science. Alternatively, they might be found nestled within the Critical Literacy or even the Cultural Literacy agendas, depending on how the goals of the course and the pedagogy are actually conceived. Different ways of doing Drama might satisfy the Personal/Artistic Development, Cultural Literacy, or Critical Literacy dimensions. Additionally, if appropriate, a single course might be credited as simultaneously satisfying more than one dimensional requirement. Courses conceived primarily as Critical Literacy might use the sorts of materials associated with Cultural or Sci/Tech Literacy. So a great merit of the proposal is that while faculty throughout the college would be called upon to carefully reconsider their courses, no particular department or division would have to face a precipitous loss, or gain, of students.

The curriculum is especially suitable for part-time students, those who are likely to be the community college clientele during the next decade. The proposed curriculum adapts for them some of the powerful pedagogical strategies that have been developed from many of the educational experiments at the college which were primarily aimed at the full-time student. The lessons taken from those experiments are frequently cited as supporting the notion of the educational community or "cluster" as the most important element in determining student success. However, we believe that although the social supports and the integration of course content so evident in clusters are useful devices, much more critical is the unity of educational vision and pedagogy. Thus, the proposal does not suggest that students necessarily be clustered, but rather that activities be undertaken to ensure that the ordinary three-credit classroom, as the part-time student encounters it, will be strengthened by placing it in a structure which supports and reinforces the pedagogical goals and approaches. To counter the fragmentation of teaching and learning engendered by the current credit distribution model, one must operate below the level of the entire curriculum, hence the notion of agendas or dimensions which would both unify and clarify a sequence of courses. The unit of instruction, especially for part-time students, is likely to remain the three-credit classroom, although the familiar linked and clustered options ought to be implemented where feasible.

Of course students who can come full time probably should, since there is no substitute for time on task. But for those whose commitments outside the college preclude that, how do we reproduce the strong mentoring components of our successful cluster programs which help students explore academic and career options, and to understand the kinds of changes demanded of them by their schooling and their hopes for professional life? The desirability of activities that address the part-time General Studies students' need to sort themselves out with respect to school and career is so great that we believe

that it must be addressed directly and formally in the curriculum. Therefore, we propose raising the General Studies degree requirement by three hours to accommodate three one-credit "Counseling/Mentoring" seminars which would be attached to appropriate courses.

The mechanics of this kind of curriculum naturally still require careful analysis. Continuing education students, for instance, might be allowed, within credit limitations, to construct their own curriculum in cooperation with a counselor or advisor. Divisions would have to decide what to do about "aspiring selective program students." One option would be to keep them in the General Studies population and thus have them fall under the range of the requirements. Or the divisions might really take responsibility for those students by constructing "shadow" curricula which would permit students to parallel existing career curricula for limited periods. However, we expect this program sketch to be appropriate for at least 75% of the current General Studies population, certainly the "options-exploring" and the "academically floundering" students as well as most "able, transfer-oriented" students and some smaller though still significant number from the other categories.

The curricular revision that is being proposed here is in some ways very conservative, in some ways very sweeping. What should be immediately clear is that it would require very intensive work by both faculty and administration to bring it to birth. Through the taxonomic device of "educational agendas" we have attempted to characterize and highlight the diverse theoretical and pedagogical understandings which are embodied at a college in which informal groups of faculty have struggled to be effective within a changing student body. Through the curricular device of "dimensions," the proposal tries to bring intellectual coherence to General Studies by providing a formal structure for these differing educational visions. At the minimum, we must devise a process of staff development to facilitate the submission of proposals from the faculty that would self-consciously signal that their goals and pedagogy are framed from a particular perspective and within a particular agenda. This we believe could be done with the use of currently available college resources. However, the college may want to consider seeking outside funding to permit a more extensive process of staff development to permit a deeper self-understanding by the faculty of what their educational visions come to, as well as ways to express them in their pedagogy.

If CCP is to be effective with the students it is now serving and will serve in the future, and perhaps be a model for other community colleges struggling with the same issues, then we must be prepared to thoroughly rethink the nature of our common enterprise, the terms in which it is discussed, and the peculiar form that our academic and administrative culture has taken. We must recognize how thoroughly tied to those older conceptions are so many of the bureaucratic relations in which we work. So perhaps what is finally our greatest challenge is to forge new forms of faculty/administration relations to create an environment which allows us together, as a college, to cordially and respectfully renegotiate our common work.

LITERATURE CITED

[1]Eaton, J. (1985, Fall). The challenge for change at the community college. *Educational Record.*

[2]Boyer, E. L., & Levine, A. (1981). *A quest for common learning: The aims of general education.* Washington, DC: Carnegie Foundation.

[3]During the past twenty-five years there have been a number of attempts to characterize the distinctive nature of the new students entering the community college. For a fuller discussion of the non-traditional student see: Spear, M. B., & McGrath, D. A model general education program. *Review and Proceedings of the Community College Humanities Association* (February, 1982); and Spear, M. B., & McGrath, D. (1985). Preparing the community college student for transfer. *Teaching Sociology, 5.*

[4]The notion of a discourse community has been developed to explicitly counter foundationalist accounts of knowledge in philosophy as well as in the natural and social sciences. The term itself comes from: Fish, S. (1980). *Is there a text in this class?* Cambridge: Harvard University Press; but the interpretive turn in contemporary thought includes such central figures as Richard Rorty, Clifford Geertz and Thomas Kuhn.

[5]Chickering, A. W. (1981). *The modern american college.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass; and Perry, W. G., Jr. (1970). *Forms of intellectual and ethical development in the college years.* New York: Holt, Rhinehart and Winston.

[6]For an application of this approach to interpreting curricula as it applies specifically to writing instruction see McGrath, D., & Spear, M. B. (1985). *Renegotiating literacy standards: Writing, pedagogy and faculty development.* Working Paper, Ford Foundation Urban Community College Transfer Opportunities Program. Although we do not directly consider the application of this orientation to remediation in this paper for a full discussion see: McGrath, D., & Spear, M. B. (in press). The politics of remediation. In K. M. Ahrendt (Ed.), *New directions for community colleges: No. 57. Remedial education in the community college.*

REFLECTIONS UPON THE DELIBERATIVE PROCESS AMONG SEVERAL ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATORS IN RECONCEPTUALIZING THE GENERAL STUDIES CURRICULUM

WILLIAM BAKER

This paper represents a different kind of research than that to which we are accustomed in the academic community. It is within the tradition of qualitative inquiry; through my perceptions and sensitivity I attempt to articulate what I see, and I suggest ways of improving what we are doing. For years I have been struggling with certain notions about learning that defy translation beyond the impact of the act, or at least they did not fit neatly into existing paradigms about what learning was and how learning could be evaluated. True, I have been able to enlarge upon learning through happy circumstantial conjunction with others whom I understood and who understood me. The dominant mode of cognition was not always words. Yet words have always been important to me, not the words themselves so much as the meaning that one can construct for others and with others out of experiences held in common, or out of what at first appear to be disparate experiences which, in fact, reveal deep commonality. Making meaning is a never-ending activity; it is also not necessarily an activity that pleases the total community within which individuals are seeking to construct meaning (to make sense out of experience).

This paper centers upon a period of deliberation among several academic administrators. Its time frame is between June 1984 and March 1985. It deals with a specific consideration of the status of the General Studies curriculum at the College. As such, there is an undeniable rootedness of this issue in the curriculum development phase of the College's past as well as a potential influence on future curriculum development within the College. Another serious aspect of these deliberations is the manner in which the deliberators viewed themselves individually and collectively. The paper on one level is a straightforward description of the deliberations as viewed through the writing the group did among themselves and, finally, the writing the group did collaboratively which took the shape of a public document that announced the institutional intention to reformulate the General Studies curriculum. On another level, the paper is an interpretation of the process from the perspective of the writer. On still another level, the paper is a speculation about the future implications of this deliberative process on the intellectual life of the College.

The major "form of representation" in the deliberative process under review is writing. I use "form of representation" in the way that Eliot Eisner uses it, to refer to the expressive medium through which a concept is made public. Eisner explains that a form of representation conveys information through its appeal to one or more of the sensory systems. When one works with words the process is a heuristic one:

> Through it ideas are formed, negotiated, revised, discovered. The course of inquiry seldom follows the path of an arrow...Although the work might have been initiated as a desire to impose a concept upon pliable material, the work itself gradually begins to participate in the negotiations...It should not be surprising that the process itself yields ideas that were not a part of the initiating conception. Working within forms of representation provides the individual with the opportunity not only to perform in the role of maker but in the role of critic as well.

Eisner continues in this discussion:

> Perhaps nowhere is the critical function more obvious than it is in writing. The first drafts that one produces are almost always riddled with ambiguities, uncertainties, lapses of logic, inconsistencies, errors in grammar and the like. The creation power of prose allows the editing process to proceed, to detect errors of omission and commission. In short, the written form makes it possible to refine thinking and to clarify meaning. The opportunity to use a form of representation can generate ideas in at least two ways. First, the opportunity to act upon the material itself motivates one to think. Countless ideas are developed because of the need to present a paper at a professional meeting, or to meet a deadline set by others. The demands of the occasion motivate the creation. Second, as already indicated, *the work to be produced is never wholly conceived prior to action. The process of working with a form of representation clarifies, confers detail, provides material upon which ideas can be worked out and corrections made.* (Eisner, 1982, p. 51)

It is my contention that within the phase of deliberations which I center upon, the group, through the medium of writing, began to use a common language. As a general rule we all make gratuitous assumptions about what others mean through the words they say. At our more ignoble level of being we sometimes take glee in conspiring against the meaning others attach to their words. It can be said with some justification that one can contrive to skew the meaning of another to ends that meet one's own purpose. It is my view that such work at obfuscating meaning is detrimental to common interests which supersede individual interests. This stress that I place upon the difficult search for meaning cannot be underscored enough. Without honest effort to collaboratively make meaning, the kind of learning this paper asserts as valuable and essential to our work will not take place.

Before I launch into the paper proper, I need to take a stab at beginning to define what the term collaboration and the adjective collaborative, as in collaborative learning, mean to me. This is a critical word both in terms of understanding this paper, the work it describes, and the future work of which it is a part. In the overall sense that collaboration means the act of working together, it includes a range of particular meaning from the less cohesive word, cooperation, to the more political word, coalition. (Indeed the word also means to cooperate with the enemy, a meaning which is not appropriate to the way I use it.) I use the term in the sense that, as I understand it, we would have the faculty collaborate with one another and with administration. This will occur with varying

degrees of intensity because of different experiences, different degrees of readiness, and different learning styles. The emphatic meaning which collaboration entails for me is one of ongoing cooperation in making meaning—in this instance, as a group of academic administrators attempting to give shape to and assert values for curriculum reconceptualizing; thence, for faculty who would work together to construe meaning among themselves which would give shape to a common learning experience for a group of students through which they would make meaning for themselves. Most importantly, collaboration takes on meaning for me in terms of what I view to be its antithesis, competition. This disavowal of competition is not intended to cut deliberation short; rather, it is to affirm that the end of our action is the furthering of a common purpose in which we believe.

Historically, the Division Deans have not held themselves, as a group, in high regard. Individually, several among us continuously strive to excel, and most of us can point to solid work that we have done. Yet in terms of being a sphere of influence in the ongoing life of the College, we detracted from the potential of our influence by not believing in ourselves. Over the years, we have been a group divided against itself. Individuals among us have on occasion fumed publicly while at other times, some of us have been instrumental in important work within the College; but there has always been a shadowy existence in which we have been mired that has tended to detract from the potential good which we may have wrought. I recall quite vividly a comment that the President made early on in her association with the College. It was to the effect that we, as a group and as individuals, allowed ourselves to be manipulated and, by so doing, allowed our work to be undervalued. Naturally enough this smarted but, ruefully, I must admit it was true.

We began to come together at a time of burgeoning institutional change with the glimmering awareness that we could be responsible for our own destiny. It needs to be clear that we did not come together for lofty motives alone. We did not come together primarily to revitalize academic life at Community College of Philadelphia. We came together to deliberate about the nature of our work and its place within the framework of the College.

The arrival of the new President *had* provided all who cared to look at their work in a different way with the opportunity to do so. The President stated her values in unprecedented meetings with the faculty, individually, and as members of departments and divisions. Individual administrators had the opportunity to state their operational philosophy to her and to offer their perceptions of the strengths and weaknesses of the College. It became apparent to some of the Division Deans that their collective role in the life of the College needed re-examination. The specific occasion for such an overt expression of concern was the request by the President for job descriptions to be updated. It was her intention to clarify work responsibilities and relationships. In the process, a job description for Division Deans was developed and sent forward. Neither the process nor the description sat well with the majority of the Division Deans. As a result of their collective dissatisfaction, the President began meeting with the them as a group. The Provost was part of these meetings as well. In June of 1984, the first of several retreats took place. Richard Richardson was the facilitator.

In a letter to Richardson to help him prepare for this retreat, President Eaton stated: "The Provost, Division Directors and I have agreed to devote one day to discuss fundamental principles, basic guidelines, significant assumptions regarding academic

programs and services. We want to go beyond our mission statement to a set of guiding principles by which we can fashion the future of the institution." In the same letter she stated:

> In my opinion, Division Directors are:
>
> - seeking to clarify and refine the direction and intent of the academic area. They want to answer, "What is important —academically?" now that we have attempted to answer the same question institutionally. They want to discuss their relationship to institutional direction;
> - ready to bite the bullet with regard to essential guiding principles by which we operate;
> - asking for clarification of their role, power, responsibility and authority. There are a number of management issues here to be addressed and will be at a second retreat.

Another fact which I want to establish at this point is that our deliberations began within the larger group of all the Division Deans, the President and the Provost. They continued in the forum of a smaller group: the President with four Division Directors (subsequently identified within the organization as Division Deans). The Deans who chose to be a part of this process were Aram Terzian, Social and Behavioral Sciences; Douglas Fenwick, Allied Health; Corrinne Caldwell, Math, Physical Sciences and Engineering Technologies; and William Baker, Humanities. The self-selection process was influenced by the fact that these divisions housed departments responsible for distribution requirements in the College. Another factor was that in the case of the Community Services and the Educational Resource Center divisions, curriculum was not the major focus of work for those deans.

In preparation for the first retreat, Terzian comments on the new *Institutional Agenda* and effort:

> What does this new institutional agenda really mean? If it does what it purports to do, it will mean that the development of institutional policy will be redirected back to the faculty. However, as much as this appears to be desirable, it will require that we address certain issues.
>
> 1. How can we re-motivate faculty to invest the time and effort required to participate?
> 2. How can we assure that participation is broad-based enough so as to include large numbers of faculty members who want to participate but are reluctant to do so because of the stress and tension that the inevitable committees generate?
> 3. How can we get the union officers to see the value of the new process, and how can they become facilitative?
> 4. How can we, as academic leaders, work in new ways with our faculty to encourage participation and new ideas?

5. How can we encourage senior administrators to take risks by allowing ideas to become implanted that may not be what we have traditionally done?

6. How can this new agenda be used as a forum around which we all become aware of and value our interdependence?"

Terzian then follows these questions with his agenda for the retreat:

> I believe that the main goal of our coming together for this retreat is to clarify how we, as Division Directors, can most effectively function under this new administrative direction. To do this, we must look carefully at our own values and attitudes to see what is facilitative of the new collegiality. I also feel that this should be carried out in the spirit of openness and acceptance. Let us value each others differences as well as looking for areas of commonality. We must, then, go on looking at the nature of our jobs and the tasks in which we are engaged in carrying out our work. Where appropriate, we must change our job responsibility to meet new challenges. Along with this it is essential that we review our status within the administrative structure. What are we in relation to others? How much authority do we have in carrying out our work? What is our appropriate relationship to the budget?

Within the same time frame, Baker wrote to the group and to Richardson:

> A statement of one's values is only an indication of what one thinks is important, or what one thinks some important other wants to hear. Values remain theoretical until one strives to put them into practice. One's actions are the clearest statement of one's values. How do I act towards the people with whom I work? How do I demonstrate academic leadership? What principles govern my actions in terms of the learning enterprise of which I am a part?

He then asserts values which encompass:

- open communication;
- trust relationship with co-workers;
- the need to empower himself to do the work as he perceives it;
- the desire to enable the faculty to empower themselves to do the work to the best of their ability;
- the desire for students to become autonomous learners so that they can survive in this society and take advantage of the resources which exist;
- the need to take risks;
- the need to demonstrate the value of evaluation by participating in the development of a sound participatory evaluation system for administrators;
- the desire for more control over his time;
- the desire to have a more direct role in budget management and development.

Baker also alludes to the difficulty of actualizing theoretical values in an antagonistic, adversarial environment, commenting in this instance more about the past than the present. He notes that the tone in the College has changed in that all have been given the opportunity to participate in the new institutional agenda and he states:

> The question on the forefront of my consciousness is how do we as academic leaders clearly identify ourselves with the new institutional

> agenda. This is not a question about how we do so as individuals. More, it is a question about how we do it as a group, thereby, influencing others in the College to see us differently.

He then suggests that as a group they have already begun by coming together to revise their job description, by getting together regularly to look for solutions to common problems, by supporting one another, by meeting together with the President, by coming together for this retreat. He continues by noting that there needs to be more harmony between the way "we are led and the way we lead," and he closes by stating, "a major part of our group task has to be to identify the barriers which still exist and which prevent us from bringing into being the things we say we believe in." In summary, I am making a case not merely to move towards shared values, but also to identify the conditions which are necessary to translate shared values into action.

The questions raised by Terzian and Baker point to their desire to do things in a different way. Both call for more collegiality, more openness, and more acceptance of valid individual differences within the framework of the institution. Both call for an explicit assertion of values on the part of the group of academic administrators. Both speak to empowerment and enabling others to become autonomous. Suffice it to say that the questions which were raised beforehand dominated the conversations during the retreat.

A second retreat took place on November 19, 1984. A memorandum to the participants from Dr. Eaton sought to clarify what took place during the retreat: "It is my understanding that the Division Directors will assume primary responsibility for re-envisioning the General Studies program." She then outlines a charge which is in essence a blueprint for reconceptualizing the curriculum and for fitting this activity into the overall College framework. It is important to note that the blueprint emerged from the discussions among the group and that the identification of General Studies as a pivotal issue was the consensus of the group as well.

The identification of the General Studies curriculum as a focus for deliberations had considerable merit. First of all, it was a timely issue. A curriculum audit had been concluded through the efforts of Tom Hawk, Executive Assistant to the President, and Jane Grosset, Coordinator of Institutional Research at the College. The Division Deans who were to become principals in these deliberations had been involved in the process, some from the beginning, others more recently. No division or group of faculty had direct responsibility for the curriculum. In a very real sense, the curriculum had never been developed; it had emerged "full grown" as an exit curriculum to move students out of the College during the Vietnam era when there were many more applicants than there were spaces available. As the audit documented, it continued to exist over the years for a very diverse student population. Although many motivated students who had clear educational goals used the open curriculum to their advantage, the majority of the students in this curriculum were not receiving the attention and direction that they needed and that students in other curricula were receiving. Not only were the students being deprived but, to a significant degree, the faculty who served these students were also being deprived of the benefits of working with other faculty and a common student body. One of the central assertions which came out of these deliberations dealt with this issue. *Thus, involvement in reconceptualizing the General Studies curriculum afforded the Division Deans the opportunity of becoming actively engaged with the faculty in a paramount educational issue.* Further, it provided them with a platform to enunciate their values in terms of

community college learning, and a platform from which to influence the educational life of the College. It clearly identified the Division Deans as important players who had the confidence of the President in this important enterprise. In summary, it was an issue that needed the attention of the entire College, and it was an opportunity for the Division Deans to demonstrate their collective thinking on academic matters, and, by so doing, establish themselves as an important force in curriculum development.

Eaton's summary of the December 14 meeting of the group is significant in that it identifies the emergence of a subgroup (Fenwick, Caldwell, Terzian and Baker) who agreed to meet during the inter semester period to give shape and substance to the plan which was evolving. Secondly, it is significant in that it outlines a plan for broad institutional involvement in deliberations about General Studies. It also identifies four areas of concern which would comprise the direction of future consideration. These determinations were summarized in the following manner:

> The General Studies Audit as well as our discussions over the past six months have resulted in our concluding that the General Studies Program, in which approximately 50% of our enrollment participates, is in need of the following:
>
> 1. Variable curricular structures such as clusters, discipline groupings, program segments, and interdisciplinary groupings. We seek to identify and organize experiences for full- and part-time students within what is now called General Studies;
>
> 2. Creation of curricular structures must be buttressed by appropriate additional support services. These include system support and people support services. System support is particularly critical at the pre-enrollment period. People support is especially important in the form of ongoing mentoring and encouragement for students.
>
> 3. Clarification of General Education requirements within the General Studies Program. This means we need to answer the question, 'What is an Educated CCP Student?' for full- and part-time General Studies students.
>
> 4. A plan for measuring the effectiveness of accomplishing 1 through 3 above.
>
> We acknowledged that these four issues were related. We further determined that "development teams" under the supervision of the Division Directors would take primary responsibility for 1 and 2. The Division Directors would turn to the Task Force on Educational Effectiveness to work with number 4 and the General Education Task Force to work on number 3...

The summary also stipulates that the group will participate in the College-wide hearing on the General Studies Audit and that they will inform the College at large about the action plan being developed. At this point, the stage is set for the deliberations. The central players have identified themselves. The strategy for College-wide participation has been enunciated. The deliberations are about to enter an active, productive phase.

Deliberations never take place in a vacuum. Thinking of every kind is influenced by the personalities and motivations of those taking part, and by circumstances within the context of the deliberations. It is my observation that, at this early stage of the deliberations, the search for a Vice President for Academic Affairs to replace the Provost and the imminence of collective bargaining negotiations had a telling effect on the process of deliberating about General Studies curriculum reconceptualization. Two of the Deans declared themselves to be candidates for the position of Academic Vice President. A third was a member of the selection committee along with the President. The dynamics of the deliberating process were affected by the conjunction of the search with our ongoing conversations and planning. And the converse was also true. The discussions about curriculum development and the emergence of a set of values and an action plan clearly influenced the selection process to the degree that the successful candidate would have to buy into the new direction under development. On another level, the role of Division Deans in the College and the operational philosophy of individual Deans wove their way irrevocably into the selection process. The interpersonal relationships of the group were also tinged by the search process.

Another influence on the deliberations was the preparation for collective bargaining and its beginnings. In another critical domain, the collective bargaining process and the deliberations of the group had an impact, too. Values asserted in terms of educational philosophy and working relations among faculty and between faculty and administration either had to carry over and influence the environment of collective bargaining, or they would become only so many empty words falling on barren ground. Fortuitously, the President plotted a course in collective bargaining that was consistent with the tone and intent of administrative curricular deliberations. It must be noted that the Division Deans were much more active in collective bargaining deliberations than ever before, both in direct representation by Terzian and in terms of being influential through Terzian and the President. To the degree that a trust relationship was building in one sphere—curricular deliberations—it carried over into other spheres of mutual activity, specifically in this example to collective bargaining.

In a January 31, 1985, memorandum to the four Deans, Dr. Eaton concluded:

> I am also concerned that you respond to this memorandum in one way or another. *I have been increasingly worried that while we say we are in agreement with regard to the fundamental issues here, we may not be—we are being too polite!*

Not surprisingly this gave rise to responses from all quarters. It should be noted that a College-wide meeting had taken place on January 22. At the meeting, the General Studies Audit was presented and the President declared her commitment to re-envisioning this curriculum under the direction of the Division Deans. There was a certain amount of urgency among the group to get a College-wide effort in motion. The confluence of thinking among the group can be traced through their writing at this juncture. Eaton, in her 1/31/85 memorandum, raised questions about "your latest draft

of the Student Flow model." She also questioned the concept of "in-take options." And she noted that her *"hobbyhorse in all of this is some structured experience for part-time, non-degree students."* In terms of the continuance of the General Studies curriculum as a degree option, she said, " . . that we have agreed that in order to preserve it, we need to improve it." In this regard she also notes the group's commitment to allow students who demonstrate their learning ability and the clarity of their educational goals "to have the totally unfettered opportunity to pursue whatever educational options might be desired."

She added another point which is at the heart of the deliberations and the emerging operational philosophy of learning:

> With regard to improvements in existing degrees, and creation of clusters, we have talked about the identification of faculty with specific efforts, the concept of a learning community, and the need to find appropriate administrative homes for these various activities. We noted the efforts such as Project II, the TOP program, or the Honors program were generally indicative of the kind of experience we wish to create for students and faculty. This means to us (I think) coherence, structure, intensified student-faculty involvement, additional demands made on students.

She raised a series of questions for which there has not been a consensus response, questions about a common core experience for degree and non-degree students, about general education requirements, about curricular design and whether or not interdisciplinary efforts will be central. She expressed the hope that the value statement, still forthcoming, will answer some of these questions, and she closed by asserting, "the need for a clear statement of what we are trying to accomplish, the ways we intend to involve staff in the achievement of our goals and a timetable."

This is one of the rare times during the period of deliberation that all four Deans wrote in response to the same situation: specifically, the direct request from Eaton, "I want to hear from you, one way or another. We are being too polite." Caldwell, who professes a dislike for the written mode in such deliberations, wrote extensively for the first time. Her intention was to organize her thinking about the many conversations and memoranda about General Studies. She provided a solid synthesis of the collaborative deliberations up to that point. As well, in each particular area she makes statements that endorse a particular point of view. Fenwick wrote in a similar vein responding more or less point by point to Eaton's memorandum. Baker took off on one aspect of the discussion, speculating somewhat in-depth on structured experiences for part-time, non-degree students. Terzian answered several of the open questions Eaton posed, and suggested the need for another meeting on the student flow model before the group tackled Eaton's list of tasks to be done.

The administrators were hoping to arrive at a flexible structure grounded on the same set of educational values. These values would give rise to commonality in the instruction going on throughout the institution, but they would also prize the individual strengths of faculty so long as the work they were doing was not in conflict with the asserted values.

Caldwell wrote:

> I am writing in response to our numerous discussions and memos on the General Studies Action Plan. The following is my attempt to organize my

own thinking. Perhaps it will help to clarify the issues for the others as well. There appear to be three principal tasks facing us at present:

1. Design of the student flow system.

   a) Description of the essential elements and processes of implementing an educational plan for all students.

   b) Design of the in-take options (programs, curricula).

   c) Description of and planning for the institutional impact of educational planning. Both the negative and positive results of comprehensive educational planning need to be considered.

2. Design of the curricular structure, both reform of existing curricula and development of any new curricula.

   a) Development of guiding principles that will apply to all curricula.

   b) Design of the general education component of all programs, curricula, etc.

   c) Development of a process for supporting, encouraging and evaluating small interdisciplinary clusters in the tradition of TOP and Honors.

   d) Development of courses, programs, certificates, etc., for students who are not suitably placed in the degree curricula.

3. Design of a process for accomplishing all of the above including:

   a) A clear statement of purpose, values and goals.

   b) A timetable for faculty involvement and accomplishment of all activities.

Caldwell, in commenting on the items outlined, called for clarity and specificity and caution, "At every stage of the planning process small pilot projects should be developed to permit testing of institutional impact hypothesis." She does not think that the faculty will move to develop options for non-degree students to the degree they would support traditional college courses. She suggested involving part-time faculty in these efforts. And she raised a similar caution: "This effort should be entered into slowly on a one-project-at-a-time basis to test the overall student and institutional response to this direction."

In terms of moving to accomplish the revitalization of the General Studies program, she stated:

> The purpose of the revitalization of curricula should reflect the needs of the students for a more coherent academically defensible, goal-directed, integrated and potentially successful academic experience. It should also reflect the needs of the college for a more effective deployment of faculty, counselors and other support staff.

And she concludes:

> The values expressed should relate to this purpose and center around the notions that the college holds about what academically defensible, well-supported, coherent curricula look like. Development of values statement should have the highest priority for division directors.

Fenwick's memorandum was one in which his first points clarified his understanding and asserted his agreement with matters as outlined in Eaton's memorandum. Then he says:

> I would like to move forward with developing a clear statement of what we are trying to accomplish and then expand and refine the "Values." May I suggest we consider the following additions—this curricular effort values:
>
> - flexibility in the manner in which it is presented by the faculty and learned by the students;
> - students' desire for a sound and useful education;
> - student progressing to more complex and difficult ideas and tasks;
> - what is to be learned and how learning is facilitated;
> - more than completing a set of courses or acquiring a specific number of credits.

He expressed a concern that we need to develop a set of working definitions, "because of widely differing meanings of some key terms we use and the assumptions about the teaching and learning process associated with these terms."

Terzian, in his memorandum, addressed what he perceives to be a sense of discomfort on Eaton's part because of a reliance upon the student flow model to the detriment of curricular design. He goes on:

> From my perspective, I see a usefulness in going at this from both directions. The student flow model gets to the issue of how best to direct students into appropriate educational experiences. The curriculum structure model identifies our function, i.e., how we are willing to engage in the process of educating students. A student flow model without a curriculum model can simply end up being a bureaucratic structure with or without substance. I agree we need to look at this in more detail. I also strongly believe that this is the area where people's values will be strongly heard.

In terms of the educational plans, he raised a series of questions:

> What role would counselors play? What would be expected of faculty? What are some new ways of providing advising services for this to happen? Would structure in the curriculum help to reduce the need for human resources at the initial stage of planning? How can computer systems help? How can we use the data from the plans for outcomes evaluation?

In terms of individual program design and planned entry programs, he raised questions about how we are going to act:

> If we are building curricula that we feel are essential in order to reasonably certify achievement at various stages, then how do we deal with persons who do not want to play our game? It seems to me that this gets back to how we view our mission, i.e., are we a cafeteria of courses or are we curriculum bound?

Baker, in addressing a structured experience for part-time, non-degree students, raised the question: How does this differ from our basic considerations?

> We are designing a new system because we found the old one unsatisfactory...Implicit to my attempts to understand who these people are, is that they will be around long enough to have a structured experience. They will know what they want or they won't know what they want. Our responsibilities are clear here: Yes you can because you are able, and because it makes sense, and because we offer the courses. Or, no, you cannot because you are not ready, or it doesn't make sense, or we do not have it...If they don't know what they want, it's too early to determine whether or not they are degree or non-degree...We have to challenge everyone in the game to either move in the direction we say we value or to move in another direction which they have to declare as a way they value. Our challenge to them is not merely do as we do, do as we say it should be done; it is to say, these things we value about learning, do something to accomplish these values.

He then notes that the values could be rejected by the wider College:

> To the degree other values arise, we need to compare them with ours. To the degree they are compatible we can go ahead on slightly divergent paths; to the degree they clash *we have a problem* which we must solve before we do anything else...The core of the variegated learning experiences we endorse at Community College of Philadelphia is that we are committed to helping students *learn how to think* (better) and to learn how *to express their thinking.* We are not engaged in telling students what to think; ironically, that is what happens when we only present information and do not ask or demand that our students think, and tell us what they think.

In terms of tasks to accomplish, he concurred with those outlined by the others. The confluence of the thinking among the group began to show itself at this juncture. This coming together generated its own energy. Within the next few weeks the group worked together on the action plan and the assertion of values. On March 28, 1985, all faculty, administration and staff received a memorandum from the President:

> The General Studies Audit contained a number of important suggestions for improvement in this key area. In response to the Audit, four Division Directors have developed a General Studies Action Plan which provides a comprehensive framework for Faculty, Administration, and Staff to move forward. This plan will be reviewed at a President's forum on *Tuesday, April 9, 2:00-3:30 p.m. in the College Boardroom.*
>
> As the plan indicates, our goal is threefold:
>
> 1. To strengthen the Associate of General Studies Degree;
> 2. To strengthen institutional services for full and part-time students;

3. To develop structured educational programming for part-time students.

Please plan to attend the Forum. Individuals will be requested to become involved with one of the Committees identified in the Plan; these committees will convene as part of Forum activity.

The introduction of the action plan took into account the several national study groups convened in the past few years which were concerned with excellence and the general poor state of higher learning. It noted, "... the kind of curriculum revision called for requires a change in thinking on the part of administrators and faculty alike. Faculty are central in the teaching process and so they must be involved in every phase of curriculum reconceptualizing and development."

The introduction established that the President had entrusted the leadership of this venture to a committee of Division Directors. It further noted that the plan involved the thinking of faculty and staff who participated in earlier discussions about the General Studies Audit and that it builds upon the experiences of faculty involved in "several different types of connected learning experiences piloted in the College." It concludes:

> Most importantly this plan should be considered an invitation to the dance. What follows is an assertion of values which we believe many of you will endorse. These values will be our underpinning in the process of reformulating the General Studies Curriculum. We believe we can provide the leadership and the support necessary to accomplish this most important task, and we look forward to a productive partnership with the faculty in this venture.

There follows a statement of institutional purpose which "is to provide every student with an opportunity to be correctly placed and to succeed in a coherent, academically defensible, goal directed curriculum." It notes the wide divergence among entering students and calls for a system which permits flexibility while preserving academic integrity.

The section entitled *"Values Underlying General Studies Revision and Development" is in many ways the heart of the document and the centerpiece of the deliberative process.* The values which emerged came from reflections of the shared experience and work place. They arose from the lived situation in which these practitioners work. Merleau-Ponty, in the essay, "Indirect Language and the Voices of Silence," which has influenced me as I write about talking about meaning and language, says:

> What we mean is not before us, outside all speech as sheer signification...With our apparatus of expression we set ourselves up in a situation the apparatus is sensitive to, we confront it with the situation, and our statements are only the final balance of these exchanges...It is always the elucidation of an historical perception in which all of our understandings, all our experiences, and all our values simultaneously come into play...All action and knowledge which do not go through this elaboration, and which seek to set up values which have not been embodied in our individual or collective history (or—what comes down to the same thing—which seek to choose means by a calculus and a wholly technical process), fall short of the problems they are trying to solve. Personal life, expression, understanding and history advance obliquely

> and not straight towards ends or concepts. What one too deliberately seeks, he does not find... (Merleau-Ponty, 1964, p.83)

Our expression of values is authentic if seen in this light. We have looked at our work situation specifically in terms of the curriculum and the learning process and we were able to chart a common course based upon the reality of our lived situation. We have drawn from our collective experience in the sense that this experience extends beyond that which we have directly experienced to that which has occurred around us. It is in this way that we stated in the March 28, 1985 memorandum:

1. We value individual freedom of choice in designing curriculum or selecting a course(s), but we insist that such choices be made with the benefit of our professional judgments.

2. We value connected approaches to learning that give students the opportunity to develop supportive relationships with their classmates in effective learning communities.

3. We value approaches to learning which are based upon cooperative planning and collaborative learning.

4. We value the integration of support services with course work.

5. We value the development of a calendar of cultural events executed in a timely fashion so that it can be integrated into courses and recommended as a co-curricular activity.

6. We value the importance of a significant general education experience.

7. We value programs of study which are soundly grounded in developing cognitive skills, thus, we value the inclusion of instructional sequences which develop the variety of qualitative, quantitative, propositional and creative thinking skills necessary to be an educated person.

8. We value the concept of mentoring.

9. We value appropriate course sequencing to include the number of second year courses commensurate to the granting of an associate degree.

10. We value defensible standards by which to evaluate the goals and objectives of the General Studies Curriculum.

11. We value the theoretical statements embodied in the mission statement to the extent that we hope to see them become embedded in all our academic endeavors.

12. We value an atmosphere of openness in which healthy spirited discourse can take place.

The section on process which followed asserted: "Our intent is to begin immediately with this public assertion of values. We hope you will join us to affirm these values as your own, or to suggest modifications and additions at this convention on April 9, 1985."

No one who came to the meeting suggested different values or questioned the ones which we had asserted. We do not take silence for consent, any more than we take it as dissent. It remains to the future whether or not these values will stand and be the basis of curriculum reconceptualizing. The asserted values were a clear outgrowth of our administrative deliberations. They provided a consistent administrative perspective as to what would govern the reform of this curriculum. Implicit also is the effect these asserted values will have on all future curriculum development and revision at the College, and they emanated from a group whose grounding in curriculum theory and practice was quite diverse.

Over the summer the President and the Vice President for Academic Affairs established an Office of General Studies under the leadership of Aram Terzian. It will be the responsibility of the office to identify interested faculty and to organize curriculum teams which will develop core proposals to be tested with the next academic year. These development teams will be guided by the values which emerged from the administrative deliberations. To the degree the teams are actively participative, values will be added and amplified. It will be a challenge for the administrative group to continue to be involved in curriculum development, especially since they are committed to faculty emerging as leaders and prime movers in curriculum development. The single most important goal will be to involve a broader, representative group in curriculum conceptualizing. Unless there is significant across-the-board representation, efforts at reform will be limited.

From the distance of a short leave from work, I look across the distance to a specific period of time at work. The present envisioned at this time is not the present yet. It is problematical that we will ever arrive at that imagined point. The demands of time change. Priorities shift. The current crisis is more completely fiscal than in the period upon which I am reflecting. Then the major order of business had to do with continuing to work together and to break from the negativity of a strife-burdened past. The ability to solve our most serious problems had continued to elude us. The matter of General Studies curriculum revitalization is a serious one. It clearly does cut across our professional lives more completely than any other real issue; it does, that is, if we believe that the primary reason for our being associated with this work place has to do with teaching and learning. I am speaking to the teachers and to those who support instruction directly—the "academic administrators." I set this descriptive phrase off to underscore the meaning I attach to it, at the same time acknowledging that for some this amounts to a contrast in terms. It seems to me that those of us under this umbrella have, as a class, forgotten the primacy of learning in our work. We have not deliberately set out to forget it. Rather, it has slipped away as the immediacy of the demands upon our time and our consciousness shift to the need to earn a living, the nature of working conditions, and our alienation from one another—from people who do different work at the College—and as we become more and more distant, more estranged from our students.

The impetus for the changes we are proposing grew out of the collective experiences of many at the College who are committed to education as a transformative, emancipatory, empowering activity. It grew out of conviction on the part of practitioners that certain ways of doing academic business are essential if work at this College is going to make a difference. It will cost more money for faculty and curriculum development at a time when there is widespread fiscal uncertainty at the College. To the question, "Can we afford it?", I counter, we cannot afford not to; our future as an institution is at stake. To the administration, I say we must find ways to support necessary curricular and faculty

development. To the faculty, I say we must change the way we have been doing business. The deliberations of the academic administrators have provided a blueprint for change. The values we have asserted, which are central to this blueprint, are drawn from our observations of instruction here at this College; to a small degree, they are reflective of our own actual involvement in teaching and planning, they are reflective of our realizations of our shortcomings seen beyond the rhetoric of national task forces concerned with excellence and evaluation of instruction. In a very real way, we are consciously mirroring the collective concern of faculty genuinely committed to education as a transformative activity. We are saying to the students: we believe in you even beyond the level in which you believe in yourself. We are saying to the students: there are other values beyond making it in this consumer-driven society which we have the responsibility of telling you about. The programs of study we are recommending will enable you to experience these values and to elect to pursue them if you find them worthwhile. What we are about is heady stuff. It is counter to trends perceivable by economic forecasters as we, herd-like, stampede toward a consumer-driven, bipolar society of fewer haves and many more have-nots. It suggests that such a movement is not in the best interests of any of us. It recognizes our inevitable, irrevocable connections with one another. It is a challenge to the status quo. It is asking for those of us who have become comfortable in the routine of our work to question what we are doing, both in relation to ourselves and in relation to our clientele. In a real sense it carries Jeffersonian ideals far beyond the outer reaches of the early republic. At the same time it is idealistically grounded within these principles. If education can make a difference, let us struggle together to make it be that kind of experience for ourselves and our students. If it cannot let us at least stop lying to ourselves and our students and resign ourselves to a continuation of failure from which there can be no exit. I choose to part company with Sartre and to affirm with Merleau-Ponty:

> True history, thus, gets its life entirely from us. It is in our present that it gets the forces to refer everything else to the present. The other whom I respect gets his life from me as I from him. (Merleau-Ponty, 1964, p. 75)

LITERATURE CITED

Eisner, E. W. (1979). *The educational imagination.* New York: Macmillan.

Eisner, E. W. (1982). *Cognition and curriculum.* New York: Longman.

Merleau-Ponty, M. (1964). *Signs.* Evanston: Northwestern University Press.

Merleau-Ponty, M. (1968). *The visible and the invisible.* Evanston: Northwestern University Press.

Schom, D. (1983). *The reflective practitioner.* New York: Basic Books, Inc.

WHAT IS THE VISION THAT GUIDES THE CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT IN A COMMUNITY COLLEGE?

KAREN R. SCHERMERHORN

"What are the influences that affect curriculum development in a community college?" This provocative question provided a forum in which faculty could begin to discuss the goals of our curricula and the influences on those curricula. Four faculty members responded in writing to this important ques[illegible] Professors Ronald Feinstein, Susan Sherman, Martin Spear, and Fay Beauchamp. Dr. Elaine Atkins served as Respondent. In what follows, we will try to identify the goals, discuss the influences, identify areas of agreement and areas of disagreement among the four presenters, and suggest some implications for future consideration.

All of the faculty associated with this presentation discussed student influence on curriculum. Each of the four mentioned student desire for jobs as an influence on the curriculum—whether the student is in a career area or not. Three of the four discussed student lack of communications skills as requiring serious faculty attention. Spear emphasized the negative effect of low student skills in "the erosion in the standards of literacy and inquiry throughout much of education," a "leveling down." All four also acknowledge the influence of the transfer institution on the community college curriculum in that Community College of Philadelphia (CCP) students desire to transfer to a four-year college results in the faculty adopting this goal for CCP students as well. Spear comments that simple credit accumulation to meet the requirements of a transfer institution can have a negative effect on attempts to create coherence in the community college curriculum.

All four also refer to the influence of the environment in which the College is operating on the curriculum. Feinstein comments that CCP should "be relevant to changing socio-political-economical realities" in order to "improve the quality of life in the city." Sherman speaks more specifically of the requirements of the marketplace for students of nursing—that they be prepared "to care for people who are experiencing common health problems in structured settings where protocols for nursing practice exist . . . ." More broadly, Spear speaks of community colleges as "undertaking the enterprise of engaging the socially and economically disenfranchised classes into the process of full integration with the dominant culture, full participation in our civic life, and equal opportunity for advancement . . . ." Beauchamp believes Project Two achieves the goals which CCP

faculty have adopted for General Education: "'to enable students to become fully empowered as members of the community and to become fully actualized individuals with finely developed faculties of reasoning, judging, expressing, and feeling . . . ."

Feinstein and Sherman mention the influence of accrediting agencies; Spear and Beauchamp do not. One might assume that a curriculum heavily influenced by an accrediting agency would be at the opposite end of a spectrum from a curriculum with a large amount of internal faculty control over curriculum. This assumption is borne out only to a limited extent. Sherman speaks of a faculty role, for example, the decision to include General Education courses in the nursing curriculum. Although Feinstein mentions the influence of accrediting agencies, he gives faculty a major role in curriculum development, though he does not specify questions that must be addressed:"Faculty are the core of all curricula design and redesign. They possess the knowledge base and are the implementers. While curriculum initiatives may come from other sources, it is the faculty which must ultimately act on and teach the new design." Spear is more specific and gives the faculty a key role in setting up a curriculum to change the student class status: "Our own experience suggests that only a carefully designed, sustained process of faculty and curriculum development that permits the collegiate 'renegotiation' of the norms and practices of literacy can have sufficient power to counter the almost overwhelming downward drift of expectations which have such a devastating effect on the academic and occupational destiny of students." Beauchamp, similarly, gives faculty key responsibility for curriculum decisions; she asks Project Two faculty who have designed and implemented that curriculum to examine the question of whether the linguistic, economic, and, to some extent, racial segregation of that developmental program "impedes language acquisition" necessary for upward mobility, and to wrestle with the hard problem of teaching more heterogeneous students.

Three of the four faculty, then, agree on a major faculty role in curriculum development including curricula which routinely undergo accrediting agency scrutiny. Faculty must accept the responsibility for deciding what students need and, if necessary, working with accrediting agencies to modify existing requirements.

Though three of the four faculty agree on a major role for faculty in curriculum development, they disagree in at least two areas: What defines this faculty role? Is there just one approach to curriculum development or are there many acceptable approaches? On the question of faculty role, Spear argues the necessity of "sustained . . . faculty and curriculum development" to raise standards of literacy and the likelihood of student "integration with the dominant culture." Feinstein and Beauchamp are less specific on what the faculty roles should be. Feinstein states that faculty have the "knowledge base" and presumably believes faculty should implement changes they judge to be beneficial to students. Beauchamp would have faculty address the key question of whether separation is contradictory to the content of Project Two, "equality and social change."

On the question of the number of acceptable approaches, Feinstein, Sherman (and Beauchamp in the discussion period) prefer pluralism. Feinstein uses a diamond metaphor to represent the many facets of curriculum; Sherman believes "there is nothing so narrow as the educator who has discovered 'the only way'." In contrast, Spear believes that "for students to be prepared for initiation into academic and professional communities, they *must* engage in and experience the real nature of intellectual activity. This, we strongly

hold, requires a substantial alteration and upgrading of the teaching/learning process in the classroom and a deeper understanding of the role of literate activity in the curriculum" (emphasis added). The answer to the question about pluralism or "the one way" has far-reaching implications for faculty. Must faculty work together to create the intellectual climate Spear believes necessary? Or, following the diamond metaphor, can each faculty member decide on his or her own how to teach his or her classes? The abbreviated nature of the papers (it was required that each one be read in fifteen minutes) meant that each of the four faculty members did not address each of these questions to the same extent, if at all. Indeed, still other questions were raised in the hour of discussion that followed the presentations.

In the discussion, Feinstein stated it is good to be away from an "FTE mentality," in which dialogue was not considered important, and to be discussing questions of General Education, how courses are structured, and in what order they are offered. Sherman stated General Education needs to be defined. She said she had sat on the General Education Task Force, that the group had not been able to define it after two years, and that some people wanted the world, while others would have accepted a smattering of General Education courses. She asked what is really accomplishable: one ballet or ten ballets? Art? Music?

Much of the discussion centered around the need for educational and motivational support for CCP students and the belief that all curricula will fail if students do not receive this support. One faculty member maintained that Asian students do well because of their family structure and because the family values education highly. He asked how we can supply this support where it is lacking: can we be both teacher and parent? Other faculty pointed out that CCP has no dormitories in which students can sometimes find support. Our students do have to contend with large classes, health problems, and single-parent families. Some faculty questioned whether the College should try to provide this support, given that our major function is education. Those who felt that providing this support is important mentioned use of counselors, day care, mentoring by community members who "know the ropes," encouraging students to be more active in pursuing their own education, and encouraging the formation of student communities (e.g., in career programs or in the Honors Program, students are part of a social sub-system that provides help, such as study groups).

One faculty member, responding to Spear's paper, acknowledged that many of our students do need "transformation," and that, in her experience, openness and hard work on the part of the teacher has not been enough. She asked whether the College itself is a "gatekeeper," providing only a lower-track education from which most graduates take up lower-echelon jobs. Sherman asked into what we want to transform our students? She said, "I want my students to be *nurses*." Another faculty member stated he wanted to transform the members of his classes into students—people who are capable of intense scrutiny of problems. Spear responded he does not believe an individual teacher can, on his or her own, accomplish this transformation in his or her students; for this transformation to occur, the students must confront a coherent curriculum in which faculty work together to create an intellectual structure in which large changes can happen. Beauchamp added that our students need more than jobs; they need to learn about other ethnic and social groups in order to diminish separation in society. She commented that conflict between social groups has been a significant problem in Philadelphia this year. The discussion ended with a call for definition of "student" (when

we say "student" do we mean a student in Project Two? CLP? the Honors Program? TOP? a career program?) and with Beauchamp's comment that any change—in a particular class, in a new course, in a new curriculum—is very difficult.

COMMENTS BY RONALD M. FEINSTEIN: THE CURRICULUM AS REPRESENTED BY THE CULLINAN DIAMOND

INTRODUCTION

My view of curriculum may be represented by a diamond which has multiple facets. The diamond can also be broken down into many stones. This compares with a complex institution of higher learning. CCP's curriculum is many-faceted and complex.

A curriculum evolves over time. This has been my experience at CCP. I began here in 1970 teaching in two distinct curricula, the Mental Health Work and Social Service programs. I have gone through a major and several minor curricular redesigns and now teach in the singular Mental Health/Social Service curriculum which also includes two certificate programs in Social Gerontology and Addictions.

My participation in curricular matters is influenced by my assumptions/values, the facets described in the attached paper, and challenges from various arenas. I am a human service professional strongly identified with the social work profession and organizations that relate to human service education at the Associate Degree level. These are strong influences on me and impact on my program's curriculum.

Curriculum building for me, in addition to being an intellectual undertaking, is also artistry. Like a diamond cutter, I have to fashion something. I have to blend an evolving knowledge base, challenges from the community and the CCP milieu, and the needs of my students. At the same time, I deal with all that goes into the complex process of bringing about curricular change. As a faculty member vested with maintaining a sound educational program, I have to mesh what I see as reasonable with what others hold to be important. It is also important for me to enjoy what I am doing. Finally, I maintain the value that it is important for myself and CCP to improve the quality of life for my students and the community.

My vision of curriculum may be expressed by referring to the Cullinan Diamond. Perhaps I may indulge in some pretentious way and offer the Feinstein Diamond Theory of Curricular Design and Redesign.

First, a word about the Cullinan Diamond and diamonds in general. The Cullinan was the largest stone ever found. It weighed 3,106 carats or about one and one-third pounds. Amsterdam cutters divided the Cullinan into nine large stones and then into 96 smaller stones. Diamonds are one of the hardest materials known. They are multi-faceted and are considered by some to be items of great beauty. Those who deal in diamonds have been known to go to great extremes to possess them. A substantial mythology surrounds these stones. A similar situation exists for curriculum: it is hard to establish, hard to change and has many faces.

"What have diamonds got to do with curricular design and redesign?" Read and think about it. CCP's 1985-86 Catalogue is a multi-faceted masterpiece that attempts to present multiple and often complex offerings to as diverse a constituency as can be found anywhere. The opening paragraph in its "Philosophy and Purpose" section states: "Community College of Philadelphia is a two-year, open admissions institution

providing transfer, career, developmental, community service and counseling programs to all who may benefit from these offerings."

This represents the College's attempt to be many things to many different constituencies. It also represents a multiplicity of influences. Like the Diamond, the College has its large divisions represented in academic and support structures which are further broken down into the smaller academic departments and curricula. The arrangement can fit into a setting that can be a thing of beauty or a shattered mess. I believe that we at CCP today are somewhere in-between: we are in the process of gaining momentum toward fashioning a coherent and increasingly relevant college setting that can be viewed as a multi-faceted diamond of a curriculum (or a "Jewel in the Crown of Higher Education"). If, in fact, the high road of curricular design and redesign is going to be taken, all members of this College community (students, faculty, administration and staff) are going to have to work together with tolerance, cooperation and creativity.

Burton R. Clark (1964) observed that, "The fascination of education in the modern era lies in its combinations of enlarging importance and diminishing clarity." The increased importance and growing confusion results from new and expanding functions that society has assigned to education of all levels. This is certainly the situation and makes the task of bringing clarity and relevance to curricular design and redesign increasingly difficult. Ambiguity and conflict about curriculum exist at most institutions, certainly at CCP. Why are all of us participating in this discussion about curriculum redesign? It is assumed that we have sharply contrasting views. A discussion such as we are having today is important because it represents one small step toward achieving the greater clarity about curriculum that we need within this institution. Hopefully we can avoid some of the hardness and difficulty there is in altering the structure of a diamond when it comes to curricular redesign.

Let's attempt to apply my Diamond Theory of Curricular Design and Redesign to CCP. First I will discuss some assumptions that I make (and that you may find useful) when dealing with matters of curriculum. Next I will examine some of the major facets that impinge on curriculum, and finally I want to state what I see as some challenges which need to be met if we are to be successful in dealing with curriculum creation. The assumptions that I want to present reflect my value bias and strongly influence how I as an individual faculty member function in the curriculum development process. They are:

1. Faculty are the core of all curricula design and redesign. They possess the knowledge base and are the implementers. While curriculum initiatives may come from other sources, it is the faculty which must ultimately act on and teach the new designs.

2. There is no one model of curricular design that is ultimately superior to all others. Different visions/models may operate successfully within the institution at the same time, despite the reality that tensions may exist between them.

3. The process of curricular design frequently is marked by tension and conflict since there are many competing forces. Often the tension and conflict is over limited resources and/or vastly different perspectives (e.g., the generalist-specialist continuum).

4. At CCP we have a special relationship to the city since we are Philadelphia's only institution of higher learning. This is a mutuality that needs continuous defining if CCP is

to be relevant to changing socio-political-economical realities that improve the quality of life in the city. The entire city is our constituency.

5. This college must be responsive to major social issues and incorporate this responsiveness into curriculum design. We need to go beyond concerns about economic development and seek appropriate ways of dealing with issues and problems that overwhelm the people in this city.

6. Students come to us with an "implicit psychology." This is to say, they come with their own personal theory about how their world works and functions. While their own theories are informal, they are effective. We as an educational institution need to mobilize this resource that students bring and make it a much more important part of the learning process. This assumption is in large measure based on Wagner and Vallacher's *Implicit Psychology* (1977).

7. An effective curriculum in any part of this college needs to help students achieve "empowerment." (I bet we can have some interesting discussions about this.)

8. Howard Gardner in *Frames of Mind* (1983) argues that there are a variety of human intelligences. I believe that this has special implications for us at CCP. This can be coupled with the recognition that people learn throughout their life span, but that at different developmental stages the learning process plays out differently (Havinghurst, 1980). If we think about this, there are enormous consequences for future curriculum development with our growing life span student population.

9. The College is many things to many people and groups, and this reality will increase if we are to remain viable. CCP will also continue to have more varied curricula that are frequently in conflict with other parts of the College.

10. Our students are as bright as students anywhere. They compare favorably with students I have taught at Bryn Mawr and at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee. A major difference between students here and in other locations where I have taught is that here they lack preparation in communication skills. Another difference is that a large proportion of our students are engaged in a survival struggle which impacts on their energy for learning and our teaching. There needs to be much wider recognition of this by administration, faculty and staff.

11. We have a faculty that is talented and creative and fully capable of getting involved in a dynamic and meaningful process of curricular design and redesign.

There are five major facets (remember Feinstein's Diamond Theory) in curricular design and redesign that need to be understood and dealt with. Four of these are suggested by Clark (1964). The fifth is a facet that I choose to include:

A. We need a workable framework for CCP's connection to the external social structure. This includes the major institutions, structure of the population (including social class, ethnicity, and race), social problems and issues, etc. An understandable framework will enable curriculum development efforts to be creatively responsive and realistic.

B. We need to consider CCP as a social institution, part of a network of organizations and associations such as accreditation bodies, labor unions, and professional associations. When we consider just the accreditation process alone, it is easy to recognize the impact that forces outside CCP have on our internal curriculum development process.

C. We need to consider our own individual institution. What of our internal operation with all its processes, power centers, layers of administration, and formal and informal groups? Besides the formal organization with all its bureaucratic and professional features, there are the interrelated subcultures of students, faculty, administration and staff. Of prime importance are the interactions that represent the formal instruction in the classroom. Our educational practices have an enormous impact on the social structure of the school and have a major influence on what happens to those we serve. If we do not have a grip on the internal workings of our own institution, our curricular design and redesign efforts will not go very far.

D. We need to consider the educational subsystems of major institutions (described in "A") located outside the educational institution (described in "E"). There is increased relatedness between CCP and these subsystems. We can cite our efforts with business, government and the health system. This is often played out through our Division of Community Services. Curriculum development that may take place within this fourth facet tends to be the most innovative and trend-setting. If we are to give expanded service to the community, much greater effort needs to go into this fourth facet.

E. We need to consider the faculty. They are to be singled out because it is through them that curricular development must proceed. The more involvement we have, the more accountable we need to become with respect to doing a qualitative and responsive job. Too often surface changes are made without translating curriculum development efforts into the classroom. Faculty also needs to be freed up from "procedures and regulations" that govern curriculum development. These often discourage faculty from getting involved in curriculum change.

Feinstein's Diamond Theory of Curricular Design and Redesign includes a number of challenges that need to be faced:

(1) Faculty commitment and involvement in all aspects of this institution needs to be intensified.

(2) If curricular development and redesign are to be successful on an ongoing basis, we need to develop a more positive and cordial way of conducting our business. This includes relationships between faculty and administration, between faculty and between administrators. We need more negotiation and fewer arbitrary decisions about curriculum development. We all need to be less judgmental about each other's curriculum development efforts and teaching.

(3) There need to be radical new ways in which we look at education and develop curriculum. This may involve new ways of relating our adult learners, their experiences and service in the community, to the formal credit/degree-granting process (as one example).

(4) With public policy changes occurring at all levels of government, new opportunities for the creation of new programs and curricula may develop. With the erosion of health care in the community, we at CCP may want to undertake provision of health care to our students, their families, and certain segments of the community on at least an experimental basis. This could be related to our already existing allied health programs and would involve learning-for-credit and service to the community. Another example might even mean building a convention center when the current venture that the city is involved in falls through. It is possible to go on and on and to present other possibilities.

(5) If we are to serve the community in new ways, the leadership of the College will have to strike out in new directions and take risks. It is highly probable that if we do strike out in bold new directions, we will at times fall flat on our faces. This we need to recognize. It is conceivable that we should move into the research arena. Traditionally, the community college has shied away from this "university" function. The College as a whole should assume a much more forceful leadership role in the community.

(6) The reality is that we are now a "megacollege." Should we begin considering mergers with other institutions and/or seeking legislation to make us a four-year city college? It is conceivable that the citizens in this city may be better served if this were the case. A final overall challenge is to keep thinking of new innovative ways that will make this college continuously vital and exciting for all members of the CCP community.

Alfred North Whitehead (1957) appropriately observed, "The justification for a university (Community College of Philadelphia) is that it preserves the connection between knowledge and the zest of life, by uniting the young and old (or people of all ages) in the imaginative consideration of learning. The university imparts information, but it imparts it imaginatively. At least, this is the function which it should perform for society. A university which fails in this respect has no reason for existence." I would further clarify Whitehead's observation by adding that the college should contribute to improvement in the quality of life within the community it serves.

LITERATURE CITED

Clark, B. R. (1964). Sociology of education. In R. E. L. Faris (Ed.), *Handbook of modern sociology* (pp. 734-769). Chicago: Rand McNally & Co.

Gardner, H. (1983). *Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligences*. New York: Basic Books, Inc.

Havinghurst, R. J. (1980, November). Life-span developmental psychology and education. *Educational Researcher*, 3-8.

Wagner, D. M., & Vallacher, R. R. (1977). *Implicit psychology*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Whitehead, A. N. (1957). *The aims of education and other essays*. New York: The Free Press.

COMMENTS BY SUSAN SHERMAN: A VISION TO GUIDE THE CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT FOR AN ASSOCIATE IN APPLIED SCIENCE DEGREE IN NURSING

Nursing programs in community colleges were and are a planned occurrence. In 1951, as part of a doctoral dissertation at Teachers College, Columbia University, a woman named Mildred Montag conceptualized a major change in the way nurses could be educated. She looked at what nurses did in the marketplace and, based upon an analysis of these behaviors, said that there existed a common core of nursing behaviors. Using this common core, she looked to the growing community college movement and with the help of a financial donor, Mary Rockerfeller, she designed an experimental curriculum for nursing education in two-year colleges. She labelled this curriculum technical. For nursing education, this was a revolution. What occurred was a major change from an apprenticeship model education—hospital-based diploma school—to a technical vocational model. From the inception, Associate Degree Nursing (ADN) programs were designed with the following characteristics:

1) Two years in length.

2) A 50-50 split of general education and support courses to nursing courses.

3) A clearly defined desire to have faculty experts in subject matters other than nursing teach those subject areas.

4) A maximum of 68-72 credits with college laboratory ratios equated for nursing courses in the same formula pattern as for other laboratory courses.

5) A faculty who would enjoy the same rights and responsibilities as all other college faculty.

6) Students who also would enjoy the same rights and responsibilities as all other college students.

7) Faculty experts who were generalists in nursing but remained clinically competent and responsive to the needs of employers.

The success of community college nursing programs speaks to a successful vision. From the seven experimental programs in 1951, there are currently 778 programs. Of these, over 500 are accredited by the National League for Nursing. Since 1982, AD programs in nursing have prepared over 50% of new nurse graduates each year. Over 90% of these graduates successfully pass the R.N. licensing exam as first-time writers. Studies of work patterns five, ten, and fifteen years after graduation showed that over 60% remain employed and over 75% of that group are employed in the country in which they were educated. Further, Associate Degree programs in nursing opened nursing education opportunities to minorities, men, older students and other populations not previously attracted to, or allowed into, diploma education. To date, the largest enrollment by minorities and males in nursing education programs occurs in community colleges.

What do our Associate Degree Nursing programs do? Through a balance of general education, support and nursing courses, we prepared for the marketplace a graduate who has skills in the cognitive, psychomotor, and affective domains. In addition, the goals of

our program speak to the skills of verbal and non-verbal communication, collaboration, continuing education and career advancement. Further, through our goals we support the general education goals of the college; six elective credits in the humanities, social sciences or language have been designed for the enhancement of student personal development.

To achieve our goals we have systematically defined and then analyzed our objectives (outcomes). This enabled us to develop a curriculum which is cohesive and efficient. We believe we are process as well as information-oriented in that we approach our outcomes from a problem-oriented framework. Given the nature of our purpose—to prepare graduates to care for people who are experiencing common health problems in structured settings where protocols for nursing practice exist—we still recognize the dynamic nature of the individuals, and know we cannot cubbyhole all client behavior.

Although our curriculum is structured, I do not believe we negate the greater purpose of education: that of preparing for life. By providing a beginning foundation in the general education courses and by building the principles of general education into major courses, we encourage and support continuing education of a structured and unstructured nature. My vision of education always includes economics—the need to be financially self-sufficient in order to be intellectually ready to learn.

I believe what we do, we do well. I believe we serve a purpose and a need both for students and for patients. Let me quickly add that I also believe if we do not stay current in our field we will be obsolete.

Finally, I believe that our curriculum is and should be the foundation for a bachelor's degree. My vision does not limit my thinking to terminal education for my students, nor do I see only one way to achieve an outcome—in this case liberal education as a foundation for all learning. I believe one can and does, though, reorder, rebuild, rethink and rediscover throughout life—and there is nothing so narrow as the educator who has discovered "The Only Way."

COMMENTS BY MARTIN SPEAR

The broad processes by which even "university parallel" programs at community colleges have become "remedialized" are clear enough, although the particulars of the story differ from state to state and even from college to college. Counseling and advising practices which place high value on maximization of student choice and opportunity, admission and registration policies which frequently render testing and placement problematic, funding and financial aid policies which encourage rapid movement into regular college courses or concurrent placement in them, and the general cultural disarticulation of even the best-prepared non-traditional student from the traditional academic classroom, all have resulted in a blurring of the distinction between the remedial/development function and the traditional academic function. Put crudely, the appearance of large numbers of "underprepared" students in the classrooms of traditional academic disciplines led traditional academics to more and more frequently mimic the practices and vocabulary of the remedial/developmental programs which suggest either a mechanical "skills" orientation or a social service mission of individual affective development.

A variety of recent studies document the intensification of a two-tiered structure of American education. Today it is no longer in the explicit form of one system for whites and one for blacks. Instead, what we see is the erosion in the standards of literacy and inquiry throughout much of education, with only "pockets" of rigor and high quality left for those able to pay the tuition of such institutions.

Vitually all the studies of the classroom experience at the secondary and college level document a "leveling down" of the standards of what counts as sophisticated language use and rigorous inquiry. At the secondary level, one research team finds class content increasingly simplified and reduced to lists to be memorized while in-class assignments replaces homework (Sedlak, Wheeler, Pullin, & Cusick, 1985). Another study of high schools characterizes the process as the formulation of "private treaties" between students and teachers to limit the amount and quality of coursework (Powell, Cohen, & Farrar, 1985). At the community college level, this analysis is complemented by the work of Richardson and his associates. Their study of a community college system argues that the traditional role of written language in the curriculum has been undermined and replaced by more fragmented and limited language use. In their terms, this is the shift from "texting" understood as the use of reading and writing to comprehend or compose connected language, to "bitting," the production or understanding of fragmented language when the student is presented with specific external cues (Richardson, Fisk, & Okum, 1983). As with the high school studies, this erosion in literacy is produced through a series of "bargains" or "negotiations" at the classroom level as teachers, committed to a particular instructional style, that of the classroom lecture, and the limited instructional goals of "information transfer" respond to underprepared and indifferent students by simply watering down the requirements. Faculty both "transfer" less complex information to the students via lectures and demand much less literate behavior from the students by replacing term papers and essays, for instance, with check marks on multiple-choice exams. The consequences for the institution are that the norms of literate activity are renegotiated downward, ultimately altering the entire intellectual climate of the school.

Of course, the Transfer Opportunity Program is committed to an understanding of the mission of community colleges that would make them historically important—what makes

them worth having and worth saving. We see community colleges as undertaking the enterprise of engaging the socially and economically disenfranchised classes into the process of full integration with the dominant culture, full participation in our civic life, and equal opportunity for advancement. But if community colleges are to articulate such a distinct identity and educational role, then they must find ways to put language use at the center of their curricula and develop pedagogical practices powerful enough to adequately prepare non-traditional students for the literacy requirements of academic and professional careers.

What is not sufficiently recognized is that none of the alternative and weaker understandings of the social and political mission of the community colleges acknowledge the full dimensions of the literacy problem nor develop pedagogical settings and practices to address it. The liberal understanding suggests practices focusing on individual achievement in a competitive setting which is conceived as essentially meritocractic; the non-traditionality of students is largely addressed by the development of large social service organizations within the collegiate structure. Vocationalists opt for a pedagogy of training—rote memorization, the mastering of a myriad of essentially meaningless tasks, and individual definition within a rigid professional hierarchy. The social activist tries to bring students to full self-consciousness as members of an oppressed group, for appreciation of the unique values and achievements of that group and for collective political action to alter the existing social and political arrangements. The remedial and developmental attempts to reconstruct community colleges to make them adequate settings for non-traditional students also lack the educational vision or the pedagogical practices appropriate for countering the leveling down of literacy standards. Each draws on different theoretical traditions but are alike in that both inhibit the promotion of sophisticated writing and interpretation by trivializing language use. It is interesting, and of the first importance, that none of these implied pedagogical styles is directly concerned with the consistent and sustained use of powerful and sophisticated language competencies, and may be directly countering that by their insistence on the mechanical, informational, and expressive functions of language use.

Our own experience suggests that only a carefully designed, sustained process of faculty and curriculum development that permit the collegiate "renegotiation" of the norms and practices of literacy can have sufficient power to counter the almost overwhelming downward drift of expectations which have such a devastating effect on the academic and occupational destiny of students. If non-traditional students are to be adequately prepared for academic success, then there must be substantial transformations in their very conception of education and their sense of themselves as learners. Settings must be constructed which help non-traditional students experience education as something more than simply memorization and recitation. Put another way, they must be initiated into the intellectual community and enticed to participate in the practices of that community. But for students to be prepared for initiation into academic and professional communities, they must engage in and experience the real nature of intellectual activity. This, we strongly hold, requires a substantial alternation and upgrading of the teaching/learning process in the classroom and a deeper understanding of the role of literate activity in the curriculum. This is the reconstruction of the community college needed to fulfill its mission in the 1980's.

LITERATURE CITED

Powell, A., Cohen, D., & Farrar, E. (1985). *The shopping mall high school.* New York: Houghton-Mifflin.

Richardson, R. C., Fisk, E. C., & Okum, M. A. (1983). *Literacy in the open-access college.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sedlak, M., Wheeler, C., Pullin, C., & Cusick, P. (1985). *Classroom perspectives on high school reform.* New York: Teachers College Press.

COMMENTS BY FAY BEAUCHAMP: CURRICULUM AND PROJECT II

The curriculum of Project II provides a coherent structure and enriched content to respond to the problems and goals of our 700 students. It is possible, however, that the placement procedures that underlie Project II and other programs at Community College of Philadelphia may be a major obstacle to attaining our most valued goals.

When students enter CCP, they are sorted by their ability to manipulate language—by their reading and writing skills. Then the group with limited language skills is divided into three levels of remediation, Project II A, B, and C; students on the A and B levels are told that college credit courses are typically a year or two away. Whatever the weaknesses of their past schooling, students bring with them many of the problems that caused their academic failure; these are individuals who have little control over their environment. In a class last semester, one student was distressed over a child custody case, another was burglarized and beaten, a third used drugs, another had been charged with armed robbery, and the boyfriend of a fifth student was stabbed to death. After their placement each semester, some students begin classes with despair that they once again have failed; the better students are incredulous and hostile.

How does a curriculum respond? First, we invite students to articulate broad goals of education. Students readily express a desire to improve basic skills and usually have one career choice in mind. But they also want to help their children learn a wide range of subjects and to find out more about the world and how to affect it.

We also talk about what makes Project II special and successful in retaining students. We are self-selected teachers who work together; it is vital on the A level that reading, writing, and speech classes are meshed and that on the B and C level reading and writing skills are practiced on content courses taught by faculty who teach upper-level courses at CCP. Counselors come to the class to assist students in evaluating strengths that might lead to a variety of careers; specially assigned counselors are also available with office hours they publicize. Learning Laboratory tutors are professionals with Masters Degrees who work with students in small groups and give the teachers as well as students insight and encouragement. Our new Cultural Series integrates reading and writing assignments with lectures and concerts, trips to a museum or a theater.

That is the structure of Project II; it is a first-class package. We would like more counselors and more Learning Laboratory time, but we are proud of our program and this pride does get transmitted to our students. But structure is only one part of curriculum. What do we do in our classes? How do we choose texts, how do we actually teach?

The English Department sets clear goals for unmangling sentences and disentangling main ideas from supporting detail. Cognitive skills include forming and defending judgments, distinguishing fact and opinion, making inferences. All these skills, however, can be practiced with either significant content or carefully chosen texts. Skills can improve by comparing messy and clean rooms; our textbooks have imaginative paragraphs on pets and flowerpots. But in the past six years, Project II, first under the leadership of Karen Bojar and now Alison Tasch, has moved to teaching significant whole books, and developing themes that respond to the intellectual and affective needs of our students.

Sixty percent of Project II classes are English classes, and even there we experiment with different subject matters; this very innovation keeps teachers fresh and involved. We have taught both *Oedipus Rex* and *Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass,* for example. Both men can be placed in a context that helps the student build historical and geographical frameworks. Reading Douglass has led to library work and reports on abolitionists, slavery and the Civil War; Oedipus leads to the Sphinx, Aristotle and Freud. Douglass, however, has been taught more often in Project II, not only because he represents the Afro-American culture of 90% of our students, but because he struggled to learn reading, writing, and speech skills to confront a cruel society and to achieve social change. Our students do not need, as much, to learn about the perils of overweening pride. We also have taught about Ethiopia and South Africa and brought in speakers who analyzed reasons for hope in those countries. We have taught sentence structure, vocabulary and inference using materials on the cultures of Vietnam and El Salvadore.

Once we have chosen texts, how do we teach? Many of us use plays to help words come alive. Students read and respond in small groups and want to read Ann Frank's role as much as Fred Douglass's. Participating in a question and answer period in the small auditorium when a lecturer comes or asking a question at Annenberg or Temple allows students a taste of success. When they have a project reading aloud to a child or interviewing a World War II veteran or keeping a journal on a political race, they are not preparing for some far-off benefit of education, they are experiencing the current pleasure of being educated.

We feel that our approach to education in Project II fulfills the statement of goals for general education which CCP faculty have adopted: "to enable students to become fully empowered as members of the community and to become fully actualized individuals with finely developed faculties of reasoning, judging, expressing, and feeling. Students must actively participate in the process of self-development...develop commonality with the education community while acquiring specific knowledge and skills...in order to make learned contributions both to their vocation and to the greater community." Project II teachers maintain a balance among the curriculum goals as defined by Eisner and Vallance (1974). Our curriculum seeks the goals of self actualization, social responsibility, and access to great ideas while students hone their reading, writing and cognitive skills. We put into practice much of the theory associated with the decade of the 1960's (Bastian et al., 1985). We can trace our insistence on connecting ideas and experience to Rosseau.

Why then do some of us fear that this solid program may now be an obstacle to the best interests of our students? Our premise is that our students suffer stigma and defeat when they are placed in Project II. Our premise is that we practice linguistic segregation to a fine degree, separating English-As-a-Second-Language students from ours, and therefore excluding Asian, Hispanic, refugees from our classes. With more white students coming to CCP, it is evident that linguistic segregation can lead to racial segregation. But we also separate blacks who have succeeded with standard English and have broader experiences from those with narrow limited experience. A curriculum that by its structure practices racial and economic segregation mocks a curriculum that in content studies equality and social change. Linguistic segregation also impedes language acquisition. Distinguished experts Roger Shuy, Dell Hymes, and William Labov have made us quite aware that language change is achieved primarily through interaction with peers and that language analysis and drill are of questionable use. Our program may parallel the very features in our society that have caused our students' problems with language.

When we are inspired and work together, we can and do perform miracles: a student who did not speak in high school for three years eagerly volunteers to read Frankie in "Member of the Wedding" in front of the class. Never before employed, she gets a job in our cafeteria and keeps it. But I want to be assured that these classes are remedial and not just a "low track keeping my students forever out of classes where students enter well prepared and flushed with success." When Project II Level C was more exciting than any 101 class, I could wholeheartedly recommend it. But now I fear it is a track that keeps students from ever taking courses in the Cooperative Learning Project or Humanities Link, or the Transfer Opportunity Program or Honors or Human Service Careers or Early Child Development.

Our prestigious large grants from the federal government and from private foundations bring us together in creative, stimulating innovation directed toward our better students—and we begin to compete with Temple and other more expensive four-year institutions. I taught in a Humanities Linked course this semester and loved it—it was the first time I taught Faulkner since I finished my dissertation on him 11 years ago. Following the inspiration of a three-week NEH workshop given here in Spring 1985, my energies poured into that class. There were no ESL students or students who had problems with the law or child care. A few had been to Europe. For 11 years, I don't remember ever having a student who had been to Europe. My Project II class, meanwhile, was lambasted by a security guard in the Antioch Building. My brilliant lady on some kind of drugs flipped out and dropped out. The counselor who talked with me and the student had 300 students assigned her this fall, far more than last year. And where now is this unique program, this Project II, this model that helps students who can get that help nowhere else in the country? I would like our program to have more institutional priority, more integration with the rest of the school, and I would like our graduates from English 98 to take a wonderful, new English 101 with Asians and Hispanics who graduate from ESL, and with the best prepared students who enter our doors.

LITERATURE CITED

Bastian, A. et al. (1985, Spring). Choosing equality: The case for democratic schooling. *Social Policy*, 34-51.

Eisner, E., & Vallance, E. (1974). *Conflicting conceptions of curriculum* (pp. 1-18). Berkeley, CA: McCitchon.

COMMENTS BY ELAINE ATKINS: CURRICULUM VISION

When I first looked over the notes that Fay, Ron, Marty and Susan sent me, I was struck by their common appreciation of the complexity of the curriculum-making process. When most people start talking about curriculum vision, they tend to simplify, to stress only one major priority or value. The four presenters, however, all take into account the many variables and forces that impinge upon even simple curricular decisions. And all four present a balanced point of view—they talk, to different degrees of explicitness, about the four commonplaces of education: teachers, students, subject matter and the environment or milieu. Yet they each offer substantially different approaches—reflecting different value systems and priorities, indeed different language systems.

Ron Feinstein's paper, in particular, reflects the mosaic quality of any curriculum discourse that attempts to recognize and cope with the complexity of the task. The very fact that he uses a diamond metaphor reveals his understanding of how multi-faceted the endeavor really is. I find his ideas very helpful for reminding us about all the different needs we have at the College, and in his words, the importance of having "students, faculty, administration and staff" working together with "tolerance, cooperation and creativity." And I admire his clarity in defining and sharing with us at least some of his value biases. For example, he asserts that we cannot ignore our link and obligations to the city, as a city college. Later he states that we need to learn how to use students' personal theories about how they and their world function. These remarks are provocative, and I for one would like to hear more. Similarly, I would like to ask him what he means when he says we need to help students to achieve "empowerment." This phrase is currently fashionable, and in danger, therefore, of becoming vacuous. Yet, I think Ron may have something exciting in mind—I would like particularly to continue this part of the discussion. I was also interested when he remarks that we need to put elements of the external social structure (he mentions social class, ethnicity and race, etc.) into some kind of understandable framework. I do not yet understand what he has in mind—and would like to draw him out here, too.

Ron's ideas perform a real service to us in the way that good classificatory theories help—they illuminate the elements that we need to deal with in order to understand our mission. What I would like to see now are suggestions for how to relate these elements—how to put them into a rich curricular framework. The ways in which Ron, Fay Beauchamp and Marty Spear link these factors together will obviously differ. But I think we can use his language, the terms he sets out to communicate with each other about our different visions.

In many ways, Susan Sherman's presentation resembles Ron's, especially her systematic attempt to root what she does at the College to the larger social, cultural and economic context of nursing education. Unfortunately, I did not get the opportunity to read her notes in time to give them the careful response they deserve. In my first reading, however, I was struck by the attention she gives to general education, to helping her students not only become effective, efficient nurses but educated human beings. I would like to hear more about the technical model for curriculum development that she proposes, and given the opportunity, would ask her to explain how Mildred Montag's activity analysis relates to what she, Susan Sherman, does when she plans new curricula. I have worked closely with Susan and her colleagues on the honors program, and I was struck then by the non-technological approach she and Andrea Mengel took. I would like

to know how she reconciles these two approaches, what the larger framework looks like for her. I think that many educators who value both technological and non-technological approaches, and who would like to make use of both, can learn a lot from a close look at the nursing curriculum.

Fay's presentation is harder for me to respond to because the questions she raises are ones with which I, too, struggle. I have taught in Project Two and I share her simultaneous exhilaration and frustration. And like Fay, I have been involved in new projects at the College designed to attract our stronger or at least better-prepared students. I know that every time my colleagues or I teach such a class, we are moving individual classes towards greater homogeneity. I am not sure that this is appropriate, either. All of the research I have read, at least in English education, has indicated that poorer and average students do better in heterogeneous classes, and that stronger students do just as well. But I love to teach Faulkner, never mind Joyce. I do not know the answer to Fay's questions, but I do know that we need to think long and carefully about possible solutions. It's always easy in the flush of a grant or two to neglect a segment of our population.

I also want to comment on Fay's mention of imaginative paragraphs on pets and flowerpots. When I first began teaching, I culled many textbooks for nice little pieces of this and that. Such fragmentation did not really provide the rich intellectual environment I needed to create. So I too have come to appreciate the importance of significant whole books or discourse, of engaging all our students in intellectually challenging readings. People like to think, and they want to be part of an exciting community. I want to reinforce Fay's comments about selecting subject matter that counts, that is relevant in the sense that ethical and aesthetic as well as cultural concerns are relevant to our students. I think we all share the goal of helping empower our students so that they can become fully actualized individuals who can think and write effectively. The question remains of course, how do we do that? Fay offered some concrete suggestions, and Marty offers some others.

Martin's presentation is the easiest one for me to respond to in part because I have heard so much of it before as a member of the TOP faculty, and partially because it coincides so well with my own thinking about our mission here at the College. I think it also offers some answers to Fay's dilemma about dealing with remediation in a heterogeneous environment. Like Fay, Marty criticizes the use of fragmented and limited language practices. And he too laments the too frequent classroom reliance on information transfer as opposed to inquiry and interpretation of primary texts. TOP is designed to enable disenfranchised, frequently disengaged students to become part of a real intellectual community. I think Fay and Marty share a coherent, unified vision at least in its broad outlines. I would like to see much more dialogue amongst teachers in Project Two and TOP. I think they have a lot to say to each other about successful pedagogical strategies because I think they share some of the same goals: initiating or inviting students into a challenging environment, an environment that places a high priority on text-based approaches to learning and thinking. And by texts, I do not mean textbooks, but rather pieces of discourse of aesthetic and/or ethical value. I would like to see these priorities permeate our future endeavors when developing curricula at the college.

I sense, as do many other people, a willingness to try new approaches and to support new ways of thinking about curriculum. I do not think we will ever all share the same

curriculum vision, but I do think we can learn to share a common language and a greater facility in talking to each other about our ideas. Until fairly recently, many of us at this college thought of curriculum development as a technological problem or task. First we had to think of discrete objectives, then fill in the learning activities to help students realize these objectives. I think we are now ready to embrace other ways of conceptualizing the curriculum development process. I want to suggest four other lenses or frameworks, in addition to the technological one, to use as we collaboratively develop new programs, courses, and learning activities.

I am borrowing these value or language systems from Dwayne Huebner, an eminent curriculum theorist, who left the curriculum field in his fifties to be come a student at Yale Divinity School, but who handed down a most valuable framework for creating an educational environment. Huebner makes the point that implicitly or explicitly, tacitly or overtly, we use different kinds of values when we make decisions about what to teach. His thesis is that these types of values permeate all curriculum decisions. If they are made self-conscious and are clarified, the curriculum maker at least will be able to shape the environment that emerges in a conscious, deliberate fashion. These value frameworks are not meant to be applied mechanistically, but rather can serve as useful tools for curriculum discussions.

I have already mentioned technological valuing. This is the dominant mode in much curricular discourse, and the one that Susan accentuated in the beginning of her presentation. I think we all use it to some extent, even if only in the global sense of trying to figure out what our broad goals are and then finding ways to realize them. When we examine what we do from a technological perspective, we account for events that have been propelled by predetermined ends, and we can note the discrepancy between expectations and reality. Questions about objectives are most pertinent within this domain. For example, what activities will lead to desired ends? What objectives are relevant to producing certain outcomes?

Political valuing, the second lens, poses another question: What events have enabled or could enable us to remain in a position of effective power from a political perspective? We are invited here to trace the ways in which we as teachers have influenced and been influenced by other forces within the College as well as trace our role within the larger community. Ron speaks of this value throughout his presentation. It is important to come to terms with the fact that positions of responsibility and respect in our small community often influence what we do when we plan curriculum.

Expectations for curriculum can also be analyzed and valued from a third perspective, the scientific. The next question, then, is: What kinds of empirical knowledge can be gathered about the way the system is functioning? Whereas technical valuing seeks to maximize change in students, scientific valuing seeks to maximize the attainment of information or knowledge for the teacher or educator. In other words, what can new curriculum plans or designs tell us about our profession? The TOP program, for example, has made extensive plans for learning about what they do in a systematic, comprehensive fashion. They tape and analyze many curriculum deliberations and every team spends one term reflecting back on its initial experience teaching together.

As important as the first three value systems are for understanding and planning curriculum, the next two, at least for me, are even more important, perhaps because they

have been so neglected in this country and to some extent in this college, at least until recently. Aesthetic valuing, viewing the educational system as an aesthetic whole, is seldom considered. The questions I pose here are: Is the curriculum characterized by a sense of wholeness and design? In what ways do balance, harmony, integration and closure play a role in curriculum design? What symbolic meanings can be disclosed? As Huebner suggests, educational activity "is symbolic of the meaning of the educator as an individual, and as a spokesman for man." I don't think enough attention has been paid to learning for the sake of learning, to the joy of knowing and understanding for their own sake.

Perhaps most important, educational activity may be examined and valued from an ethical perspective. Here, the human situation becomes the central concept in discussing the expectations within and without the system. Questions arise about the relationships between faculty and student, student and student, administration and faculty, student and community. All four presenters paid the most attention to this dimension. I think that is one of their major strengths, and what joins them together as colleagues. I would like to see such considerations guide our discourse as we continue to articulate our individual and joint curriculum visions. I am looking forward to new conversations about curriculum visions at the college, and I am anxious to ask the three panelists many more questions about what they are hoping to do.

USING READERS' ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT ESSAYS TO DETERMINE IMPROVEMENT IN WRITING ABILITIES UNDER TWO TREATMENT CONDITIONS

ARAM L. TERZIAN

INTRODUCTION

Recent concern about the quality of higher education expressed by several national reports has called into question the benefits of a college degree. For example, the report of the Study Group on the Conditions of Excellence in Higher Education (1984) called on institutions to produce demonstrable improvements in student knowledge, capacities, skills and attitudes between entrance and graduation. In addition, the costs of obtaining an education are rising sharply. O'Keefe reported in a recent article in *Change* (1986, p. 6) that between 1981 and 1985 the Consumer Price Index rose 17%, while the cost of a college education rose 35%. This has further led to concern that colleges and universities become more accountable to the public for the tax dollars spent on the educational enterprise. Unfortunately, legislatures are reacting to this problem by becoming more involved with curriculum specifications. McCabe (1985, p. 9) expressed concern that actions taken in such states as California, New Jersey, Alabama, Texas and his own state of Florida will result in competency-testing programs that will have the effect of directing curriculum. The role of faculty in certifying academic quality and progress will thereby be preempted. If colleges and universities are to retain the right to define what will be the educational enterprise, they must address the current issues related to accountability. This must be done by developing clear measures of academic progress that reflect curricular efforts at improving the learning experience.

As a way of addressing the issue of educational quality, Community College of Philadelphia (CCP) applied for and received a grant from the Ford Foundation to improve the transfer opportunities for students by making substantive changes in the curriculum. The major feature of this new program was the development of a literacy agenda which included a heuristic approach to the teaching of English writing. There was concern, however, that this approach might have a negative effect on the traditional measures of writing ability that faculty had come to expect of students who successfully complete Freshman Composition. This study was conducted to determine if there were differences in the traditional measures of writing abilities between students enrolled in writing courses using the heuristic approach and students enrolled in traditional first-semester writing courses.

A typical approach to assessing learning improvement is to use standardized multiple choice tests. However, as Cohen (1973, p. 357) pointed out, these are indirect measures of writing ability and lack face validity for writing instructors who view them with great suspicion. Another approach to evaluating the writing skills of students is the use of holistic assessment that involves the participation of the instructional faculty in the instrument development and assessment process. This evaluation may involve an overall score or a score reflecting the application of a number of criteria. White (1984, p. 403) pointed to two developments in scoring essays that can be included under the definition of Holistic Scoring: the National Assessment of Educational Progress's "Primary Trait" scoring and the Educational Testing Service's "Holistic Scoring." While Primary Trait scoring emphasizes the use of criteria in assessment, both groups use a single overall score and approach the process of scoring papers in similar ways.

The scoring approach used in this study was based on eleven criteria identified by members of CCP's English Department as measures of writing ability. The analysis of the data included both individual criterion scores and a total score, which was simply the sum of the criterion scores. While a single holistic score is commonly used at the College for placing students in courses, the use of faculty-identified skills or criteria that define writing was considered to be of more value for this study. The use of a criterion-based scoring process could serve to help faculty analyze differences in pre-test and post-test scores on individual criteria and to search for possible reasons for such differences.

Questions To Be Answered

(1) Was there a difference in writing skill improvement between the experimental and comparison groups after completion of the first college-level writing course?

(2) Was the approach used to assess writing reliable and valid?

METHODOLOGY

Study Design: A pre-test and post-test design with a non-equivalent comparison group was used in this study. The experimental group consisted of three sections of English 101 classes of Transfer Opportunities Program (TOP) students and the comparison group included five classes of English 101 (non-TOP) students. The three TOP English 101 sections represented all the sections offered in the program, while the comparison group classes were selected from among English faculty willing to participate in the study. The pre-test was administered during the third week of class and the post-test ten weeks later.

Development of an Assessment Tool: It was important that the method used for assessing the writing skills of the students was perceived by the English faculty as a valid one. For this reason, we asked the English Department Chairperson to identify the criteria that the Department thought were important in assessing writing skills. As a result, eleven factors were selected to represent three broad areas of writing: content, organization and mechanics. Figure 1 identifies the factors that were used in this study. Student performance was measured using a four-point scale for each criterion. In addition, the sum total of the eleven criterion scores were used as an overall score of performance.

FIGURE 1

FACTORS USED TO EVALUATE WRITING

Content

- Logical and rational ideas (RATIONAL)
- Ideas expressed with clarity (CLARITY)

Organization

- The statement of a thesis (THESIS)
- Thesis adequately developed (DEVELOPED)
- Every paragraph is relevant to the thesis (RELEVANT)
- The development includes concrete details (DETAILS)

Mechanics

- Skills in spelling (SPELLING)
- Skills in punctuation (PUNCTUATE)
- Skills in the use of verbs (VERB)
- Skills in avoiding errors in word usage (USAGE)
- Skills in avoiding distracting awkward sentences (AWKWARD)

The Experiment: All students in the study were given an in-class writing assignment at the beginning of the semester and again at the end of the semester. The assignment was as follows:

> How responsible is the tobacco industry for causing or abetting various human diseases that have been linked to cigarette smoking? Can the tobacco companies be compared to the drug companies that have manufactured and marketed products that have caused illness and even death? Or should they be compared more to companies that produce alcoholic beverages? If the selling of cigarettes is not banned by law, should tobacco companies be held responsible for the health threat that cigarettes pose?
>
> Taking one side or the other, write a complaint filed by a citizen who feels tobacco companies are responsible for and guilty of endangering the health of smokers and non-smokers, or write the reply to criticism given by an executive who works for a tobacco company.

A total of 125 students wrote papers for the pre-test; 66 in the TOP group and 59 in the non-TOP comparison group. For the post-test, 47 TOP students who wrote papers for both the pre-test and post-test were included in this study.

Scoring of Papers: Three English faculty members experienced in holistic assessment were hired from a neighboring community college to judge each writing sample. After an initial orientation and practice with sample papers, they proceeded to score the papers with instructions to take their time and to rest frequently. The papers were scored using a double blind procedure in which the judges did not know to which group the writer belonged nor whether it was the pre-test or post-test paper. Each judge evaluated each paper on the eleven factors described above using a four-point scale; 4 = excellent, 3 = good, 2 = fair and 1 = poor. Each subject's score on each item was the sum of each judges rating for each item. In addition, a total score was computed for each subject by summing each subject's scores on the eleven factors.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The purpose of this study was to determine whether either the experimental or comparison group made significantly more gains in the ability to write as defined in this study. Because of the non-equivalent group pre-test/post-test design, the appropriate statistical procedure was to measure differences in gain scores using t-tests for independent samples (Campbell & Stanley, 1966, p. 49).

The results clearly show that the non-TOP group made larger gains than the TOP group in eight of the eleven criteria. However, the comparative gains of the non-TOP group were probably inflated because the mean scores of the TOP group on the pre-test were much higher than the non-TOP group, consequently resulting in a ceiling effect for the post-test scores for the TOP group. To examine this possibility, subjects with extremely high and low scores on the pre-test were eliminated and a second t-test of gain scores was computed. The results indicated that the non-TOP group made larger gains on six of the eleven, while the TOP group made higher gains on three and there were two virtual ties, none of the gains being statistically significant. Table I summarizes the results.

TABLE I

MEAN GAIN SCORES
TOP and Non-TOP Groups by Criteria

	All Scores			Mid-Range Scores		
Criteria	TOP	Non-TOP	T	TOP	Non-TOP	T
Rational	.43	.80	-.93	.62	.91	.66
Clarity	.55	.71	-.37	.67	.77	-.16
Thesis	.59	.48	.19	1.00	.32	.71
Developed	1.02	1.11	-.17	1.29	1.27	.02
Relevant	.47	1.50	-1.93*	-.05	1.05	-1.41
Details	.96	.61	.72	1.67	.59	1.41
Spelling	.74	.54	.44	.81	.46	1.03
Punctuate	.30	.41	-.24	.00	.32	-.36
Verb	.51	.61	-.21	.52	.54	-.03
Usage	.57	1.04	-.86	.14	1.09	-1.15
Awkward	.21	.76	-1.36	.19	1.00	-1.38
Total Score	6.36	8.59	-.60	6.86	7.91	-.18

* $p. < .05$

A second major concern of the study was to determine whether the approach used to measure writing could be considered reliable and valid. The reliability of the judging was evaluated using a one-way analysis of variance of the scores assigned by the three judges to each criteria both on the pre-test and the post-test. In addition, the reliability of the overall score was determined by simply adding the 11 criterion scores and using the same statistical procedure. These results are reported in Table II. There were significant differences among the three judges on four of the criteria on the pre-test scoring. There were two additional significant differences in scoring on the post-test. However, when the criteria were added to give a total score, there were no significant differences among the three judges.

TABLE II

RESULTS OF ONE-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
AMONG THREE JUDGES BY CRITERIA

Criteria	Pre-Test F-Score	Post-Test F-Score
Rational	4.49**	10.44**
Clarity	2.38	3.66*
Thesis	2.09	1.91
Developed	1.64	1.95
Relevant	16.51**	11.84**
Details	2.17	3.45*
Spelling	1.39	1.28
Punctuate	3.92*	4.16*
Verb	4.45**	3.21*
Usage	2.18	0.46
Awkward	0.34	0.32
Total Score	2.20	0.82

* $p. < .05$
** $p. < .01$ level of significance.

If it could be determined that one judge differed significantly from the other two in scoring the student papers, it would then be possible to reduce judging variability by eliminating that judge's score from the study. To determine if there was a pattern of disagreement among the three judges, a Scheffe test was computed and the results indicated that Judge #1 scored significantly differently than Judge #2 four (4) times, Judge #1 with Judge #3 five (5) times, and Judge #2 with Judge #3 three (3) times. This would indicate that there was no consistent pattern of disagreement among the three judges. Therefore, variability could not be reduced by eliminating one of the judge's ratings.

Criteria used in this study to measure the writing ability of students were based on specific skills identified by faculty as being components of writing ability. As described in Figure 1 previously, there were three components of writing ability within which the eleven criteria were categorized: content, organization and mechanics. It was of interest to see if judges scored in a manner that fit into the identified categories. To do so, a factor analysis was performed on the criteria. A two-factor model seemed optimal using only those factors with eigenvalues over 1. These two factors accounted for 73% of the variance. As identified in Table III, the high loading variables in Factor I were all the content and organization variables, while in Factor II they were the mechanics variables.

TABLE III

FACTOR ANALYSIS OF CRITERION VARIABLES

Factor Names	Factor Loadings*	
	FACTOR I	FACTOR II
Developed	.88	.17
Details	.83	.16
Rational	.80	.41
Relevant	.77	.20
Clarity	.75	.52
Thesis	.72	.23
Usage	.22	.86
Spelling	.15	.84
Verb	.23	.84
Awkward	.45	.77
Punctuate	.26	.73

* Factor loadings after Varimax rotation.

Another important issue in criterion-based writing assessment is the validity of the scoring method. Specifically, is it sensitive enough to measure gains in learning from the beginning to the end of an English writing course? There was the expectation that if this method of assessment had any validity, post-test writing scores would be better than pre-test writing scores for both groups since they both underwent instruction in writing. To evaluate this, both the TOP and non-TOP groups were combined and a t-test for paired samples was computed between pre-test and post-test scores on each of the eleven criteria and the total score.

Table IV identifies that students made significant gains on ten of the eleven criteria as well as the total score.

TABLE IV

MEAN PRE- AND POST-TEST SCORES AND T-TEST VALUES
TOP AND NON-TOP GROUPS COMBINED BY CRITERIA

	MEAN SCORES		
Criteria	Pre-test	Post-test	t-value
Rational	6.58	7.19	-3.00**
Clarity	6.48	7.12	-2.84**
Thesis	7.46	8.00	-1.77*
Developed	5.45	6.51	-4.08**
Relevant	6.83	7.83	-3.65**
Details	5.53	6.29	-3.13**
Spelling	6.99	7.66	-2.90**
Punctuate	6.16	6.55	-1.57
Verb	7.72	8.29	-2.38**
Usage	7.02	7.83	-2.96**
Awkward	6.50	6.93	-2.19*
Total Score	75.43	82.34	-3.34**

* p. < .05
** p. < 01, One-tail test of sign.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Main Results

The major concern of this study was determining whether there were any significant differences in the gain in writing ability between the TOP students and the non-TOP comparison group. The results indicated that both groups showed gains in writing ability from the beginning to the end of the course in all categories. However, when corrections were made for ceiling effects, there were no significant differences between the two groups. Both groups gained from the freshman English experience equally as well.

It can be concluded that the method of teaching writing used by the TOP faculty did not have a negative effect on the ordinary measures of writing ability in English 101. However, what this study did not do was measure any specific writing skills that TOP faculty have identified as being important to their students. These are not part of the ordinary notions of writing ability. For example, they focus on whether or not the writer is able to "manage a careful construction of a network of relations among bits of information." A follow-up study needs to be conducted to determine if TOP students do indeed benefit significantly from this experience. This must be done by carefully constructing an assessment scheme to measure TOP-defined criteria as described above.

Reliability of Scoring

When using the total score, however, there were no significant differences among the judges. Thus, by averaging out the criterion scores and then adding them to form a total score, the effects of judging variability are reduced. Used in this way, the reliability is greatly improved.

Variability in judgments can be reduced most effectively by using structure procedures in scoring writing assignments. White (1984, pp. 404-405) identified six procedures and practices that have been developed to reduce unnecessary variability in the scoring process. These include controlled essay readings, a scoring criteria guide, sample papers for judges to use for practice, checks on the reading in progress, multiple independent scoring and evaluation, and record keeping.

There were three main factors that faculty had identified as being the measures of writing ability: content, organization and mechanics. A factor analysis of the scores clearly demonstrated a factor related to mechanics. However, the other major factor appeared as a combination of content and organization. If one wanted to apply sub-scores, for example, to see if one group gained more on the mechanics of writing than the other, such an approach would have internal reliability. Beyond that, it would not be clear as to what was being measured.

The results did indicate that there were significant differences among the three judges in the scores they assigned to the criteria. On the pre-test, four out of the eleven criteria showed significant differences and on the post-test, six significant differences. This raises the question about the value of using the individual criterion scores for assessing gains in specific areas of writing ability. Guilford (1954, p. 289) suggests that by averaging the ratings of a number of judges to obtain a single value for a given ratee in a given trait, there is no need to correct for differences in mean ratings among judges.

Validity

Any assessment of writing skills that is to have credibility with English faculty must have face validity. An instrument that is constructed with the agreement of writing instructors certainly has a better chance of being viewed as a valid assessment of student writing than the use of indirect measures. The assessment tool used in this study was developed in cooperation with the English department. It differs from the approach they use in placing students in composition courses, theirs being a typical holistic assessment with one score assigned to a paper using a scale of one to six.

Another approach to assessing validity suggested by Cohen (1973, p. 365) is to assume that students will learn over the course of a semester. An instrument's validity can be assessed by how well it reflects such gains. This study clearly demonstrated significant gains in scores from the pre-test to the post-test when both the experimental and comparison groups were considered together. This is encouraging for those who wish to use writing samples to evaluate student gains, since it illustrates that under the controlled conditions of a double blind study, an assessment of writing judges using criteria for judging papers can be effective.

DISCUSSION

Measuring the writing abilities of students through some criterion-based method of judging, be it Holistic Assessment or Primary Trait Assessment, raises some interesting issues that could help colleges sharpen their ability to judge both their students and their programs. These issues are:

* The use of writing samples to measure group gains in writing ability either for experimental designs or for measuring program outcomes (value-added).

* The use of writing samples for crediting individual students after completion of writing courses.

* The use of writing samples to place students into appropriate course levels.

Measuring Group Gains

This study demonstrated that the use of writing samples to measure a group of students' gains in writing is indeed valid. The measuring device was sensitive enough to pick up significant changes in ten of the eleven criteria as well as the total score. In addition, using both statistical control by averaging judges' scores and by providing appropriate training and conditions under which judging is carried out, the variability of judges' ratings can be reasonably controlled.

However, when the criteria were analyzed individually or grouped into categories, the appropriateness of their use was suspect. The judges in this study were not consistent enough to assure appropriate reliability of an individual criterion score as a meaningful measure of gain on that particular criterion. Whether judges could be trained in scoring and the judging protocol standardized to minimize variability to the point where individual criterion could be used in diagnosing student writing abilities or in measuring change, is a topic that should be explored in another study. Further, the three categories of writing ability identified in this study-content, organization and mechanics-were similar to but not the same as the criteria around which the judges in this study seemed to have organized the criteria. They identified two factors: mechanics and a combination of content and organization. The use of a single score, then, seems to be the most reliable approach to measuring gains in writing ability and for placing students into courses.

The use of the quasi-experimental design proved useful and could be of value in testing the ability of courses and curricula to improve the writing skills of students. In either case, care must be taken to use research methodology that will assure an unbiased look at results. A career program that has made alterations in their curriculum to encourage writing across the curriculum, for example, could use such a research design to determine the effectiveness of their efforts. Another use could be to evaluate different approaches to the teaching of writing. In this instance, it would be important that this be undertaken with a careful description of the criteria that would be used to measure the expected learning gains.

Measuring Individual Gains

Using a writing sample to determine how much an individual student gained from a course has some important limitations. For example, any scale that is used to determine

the writing ability of students will have upper limits. Students near those upper limits when judged on their initial writing sample cannot be expected to gain as much as students who are further down on the scale. Judges are much more able to see change in the middle ranges then near the top of the range.

Judging individuals on the basis of one writing assignment assumes it can measure the essence of the writing done through the semester. While this can be an appropriate measure for groups, it presents problems when judging individual performance. For example, the assignment may prove inappropriate for a particular student. Or a particular student's writing may have idiosyncrasies that will have an unduly positive or negative influence on the judging. In each case, the student will be assigned a grade that does not really represent his or her level of writing ability.

To properly use a final writing assignment as a crediting device requires a procedure to assure high levels of reliability of grading. The paper should be judged by three persons who have been adequately trained and appropriately supervised. Faculty who share the same educational goals in writing, for example, could get together as a team and do the judging of final papers in all of their courses. Students will then be assigned a grade that represents the average of the judges. This would greatly reduce the possibility of a student being graded unfairly.

Use for Course Placement

It has been demonstrated that with adequate training and supervision, judges can make satisfactory judgments of writing samples. The holistic approach has been used by a number of colleges and universities for that purpose. Again, it must be done with the understanding that the use of one writing sample has the problem of a certain number of students being misplaced. Students may react disfavorably to the assignment. They may not have been prepared to do the testing. The judging of papers may not have been carefully controlled. To minimize such errors, such a system of placement must allow for adjustments for errors by allowing re-testing upon request or re-evaluation during the beginning weeks of the writing course.

Another aspect of using the writing sample for course placement is its predictive validity. It is essential that periodic studies are carried out to determine how well the writing samples predict the appropriate course placement of students.

In summary, holistic assessment of writing has its greatest value in measuring gains in writing of groups of students. It is most effectively used to evaluate program outcomes. Under adequately controlled conditions, it can also be used effectively for initial placement into courses and for crediting for course completion. In all cases, persons using holistic assessment must take care to use the proper protocol for judging papers and must select criteria that represent the writing goals that are being measured.

LITERATURE CITED

Campbell, D. T., & Stanley, J. C. (1966). *Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research.* Chicago: Rand McNally.

Cohen, A. M. (1973). Assessing college students' ability to write compositions. *Research in the Teaching of English,* 7(2), 356-371.

Guilford, J. P. (1954). *Psychometric methods.* New York: McGraw Hill.

McCabe, R. H. (1985, Spring). Equity and quality in college education: An essential american priority. *Educational Record,* 4-9.

O'Keefe, M. (1986, May/June). College costs: Have they gone too high too fast? *Change,* 6-8.

Study Group on the Conditions of Excellence in Higher Education. (1984). *Involvement in learning: Realizing the potential of american higher education.*

White, E. M. (1984). Holisticism. *College Composition and Communication, 35*(4), 400-409.

RESPONSE BY JANE GROSSET

From a design perspective, the author of this study should be commended for the combination of methodological procedures and statistical analyses that were introduced to enhance the validity of his field research.

I particularly liked the methods used to construct the writing ability measure. By using specialists from the English faculty to identify 11 dimensions of writing ability, the author has strengthened the validity and reliability of the measure and, consequently, confidence in his findings among the group who are in a position to directly act upon the research results.

Theoretically, use of a multi-attribute-holistic approach for assessing a construct as complex as writing ability is essential; however, it is difficult to apply empirically, as evidenced by greater inconsistencies in this study and factor analysis results presented in Tables II and III. Perhaps 11 criteria of writing ability represent too much of a good thing, making it difficult for judges to accurately distinguish among the separate items. The author's use of total writing ability scores, in addition to item analyses, corrects for this problem and should be the focus of attention when addressing findings associated with this study.

The use of a quasi-control group introduces a set of baseline figures against which TOP student writing ability outcomes can be compared. Because of the non-random selection of the non-TOP sample, disparities in pre-test writing ability measures existed between the two groups. The author acknowledges this difference and corrects for the inequality across the groups in two ways. Student growth, measured by gain scores, is the unit of analysis, thereby adjusting for the lower writing ability of the non-TOP sample on the pre-test measure. To further control for group differences, students with either very low or very high pre-test scores were dropped from the sample. A better approach would have been to compute a group comparison t-test using only writing ability pre-test scores. If this approach indicated the two groups were significantly different, then an analysis of covariance could have been computed using gain scores, while controlling for initial writing ability. This approach would not result in a deflation of the sample and would provide additional information about the effects of initial writing ability on gains.

The self-selected nature of the non-TOP English sections introduces another source of bias, teacher effects, which the author fails to address. It has been demonstrated that individuals who volunteer to participate in studies differ in a variety of ways from those who do not volunteer, including ways that could affect the classroom process. The unrepresentativeness of the non-TOP sample could result in the skewing of gain scores, thereby masking real differences which existed between the groups. Unfortunately, nothing short of mandating participation in the study can correct this shortcoming. Since this is impractical in the College's setting, the solution calls for reviewing the results of the study with this problem in mind.

I think a natural extension of this study would be a follow-up on the mortality rate associated with the groups. Twenty-nine percent (29%) of the TOP sample and 24% of the non-TOP sample dropped out of the study. The reasons associated with their attrition should be explored and the results of this study reexamined with these results in mind.

RESPONSE BY ELAINE ATKINS

I'd like to respond to this study by first talking about what it is not; it is not an attempt to compare TOP and non-TOP students by applying criteria reflecting the pedagogical emphasis in TOP classes. For example, as the author notes, TOP faculty pay a great deal of attention to helping their students construct "a network of relations among bits of information." This goal permeates all instruction, including writing. Yet the evaluation report reveals no criterion specifically selected to address the issue of greater facility in constructing relationships among ideas.

Instead, the study is an effort to apply "traditional measures" of evaluating writing abilities. This is, I think, its greatest strength as well as weakness. Such fairness serves to allay the concerns of even the most traditional English instructor, especially one who pays a great deal of attention to the "mechanics" of good writing. Five of the criteria are devoted to independent, isolated skills such as the use of verbs or correct spelling. And the total score reflects this emphasis on mechanics (five of the criteria are devoted to mechanics, and six devoted to both content and organization—the two aspects that the great majority of English teachers would consider most crucial).

On the other hand, the attempt to design a set of criteria acceptable to those instructors who do not place a particularly high value on interpreting, creating and expressing relationships in discourse has its consequences; it precludes the possibility of finding out if TOP students are more successful than the control group in improving those aspects of writing most highly prized and emphasized by their professors. In this sense, I urge the author to consider his work so far as a fair, but first, step. I would like to see a second evaluation study that deliberatively takes into account those criteria deemed particularly pertinent to the goals and rationale of the TOP program. Together, the two studies could serve as a model for future curriculum evaluation projects at the College.

RESPONSE BY SHERRY ROSE-BOND

It was good to see this study undertaken and conducted in a manner consistent with many of the principles of effective program evaluation: the topic is significant with far-reaching consequences both within and without CCP; those whom it would affect most directly were involved at the outset; the objectives were established in advance; the criteria used had sufficient range; sophisticated statistical techniques were employed.

The discussion concerning scoring methods was extensive and included many aspects of the issue. It should be read by those involved in placement, program and curriculum audits, and all faculty involved in writing instruction (which includes all faculty).

However, the study also raises a number of questions with respect to the research methodology used. The experimental design used was that for nonequivalent control groups (Campbell & Stanley, 1966, p. 49). The critical issue is found in the same source (pp. 47-48): "The more *similar* the experimental and the control groups are in their *recruitment*, and the more this *similarity* is confirmed by the *scores on the pretest*, the more effect this control becomes." (italics mine)

TOP students are selected, recruited and agree to participate in the TOP program. They are new students chosen by their scores on the CCP placement test, their interest in transferring, and their curriculum choice. The Non-TOP students are in no special program. They may have the same scores on their placement tests, they may have advanced from a lower level of English, they may be transfer students, they may have been here for many semesters but are taking their first English class, or they may be repeating English 101. They represent all curricula and they may or may not want to transfer. Thus, there may be a great many differences in their maturation, interest, and motivation which can result in differentiated outcomes. In fact, the mean scores of the TOP group were reported to be significantly higher than those of the Non-TOP group.

Implementing the design successfully should involve consideration of a series of questions:

- In what ways are the TOP and the Non-TOP students different? The same?

- Were the three Non-TOP classes receiving similar instruction or were they, essentially, three different Non-TOP groups? (This does not even address the issue of teaching variability.)

- Is it absolutely certain that no aspects of the heuristic approach were used in the Non-TOP classes and that *only* a heuristic approach was used in the TOP classes?

- Aside from participation in the TOP program (itself a considerable difference), were there any other consistent differences between the way in which the TOP and the Non-Top groups were treated?

- Were there any significant differences in the experimental mortality between the two groups which could represent a significant bias?

Analysis of covariance is considered by Campbell and Stanley to be a more desirable method than using gain scores to adjust for the differences between the groups. However,

the t-test is a robust test which is primarily sensitive to differences in means and relatively insensitive to non-normality of distribution and heterogeneity of variance provided the number of cases is approximately the same and is of sufficient size. It would be valuable to have information concerning how well the assumptions underlying the t-test are met. Since the groups were not selected on the basis of their pre-test scores and since, in one part of the study, the scores at the extremes are eliminated, we can disregard the phenomenon of regression.

This study answers some questions, raises more questions, and, unquestionably, makes a valuable contribution to the literature on the assessment of writing, especially with a community college sample. There is more for us to do.

FACILITATING INPUT COMPREHENSION FOR SECOND LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT AND ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT IN TRANSITIONAL COLLEGE COURSES FOR ENGLISH-AS-A-SECOND-LANGUAGE STUDENTS

A Report on Research in Progress

SUSANA SOTILLO

The present study is designed to investigate whether conditions which have been shown to promote (1) second language comprehension and second language development and (2) content mastery exist or are more or less available in transitional college-level classes (i.e., sections of college-level classes set aside for students of limited language proficiency who are pursuing academic degree programs). Previous research on conditions for language comprehension which seeks to identify features in the input available for interaction has been conducted in settings that were set up for the researcher's specific purposes (e.g., Long, 1985a; Chaudron, 1983, 1985) or dealt with one-on-one native speaker-non-native speaker relationships. In addition, previous research on content mastery undertaken by Canadian investigators has focused on children and adolescents (Genessee, 1983; Stern, 1981). The successful outcomes of Canadian-French immersion programs (Swain & Lapkin, 1981) have demonstrated that a second language is learned not specifically by direct instruction in the rules of the language, but by using the language in meaningful contexts.

Few studies have investigated second language development and content mastery among adults. A common complaint among college instructors concerning English-as-a-second-language (ESL) students is that they are not well enough prepared to handle college-level material. Peterson (1985) describes the success of a "bridge" course which involved two courses taught in tandem at Macalester College. Her findings reinforce the notion that at high levels of language learning, comprehension and performance depend on cultural, cognitive, and organizational skills as well as on language skills.

Based on the empirical findings reported in the Second Language Acquisition (SLA) literature, the following hypotheses will be investigated:

(1) whether the transitional college classes provide the kind of input and interactional modifications which have been shown by SLA researchers (Pica, Doughty, & Young, 1985) to facilitate comprehension, and are claimed to facilitate second language acquisition;

(2) whether the use of the second language as an instrument of instruction, as opposed to being the object of instruction, contributes to second language development and content mastery (Swain, 1984; Genessee, 1983; Wesche & Ready, 1985).

SUBJECTS

The individuals involved in this study are community college students ranging in age from 19 to 53 years. These students have been identified through testing as needing ESL instruction. Presently, they are registered for one or two content courses (e.g., Psychology 101, Sociology 101, Medical Record Technology [MRT] 105, etc.) which they take concurrently with two or three high intermediate or advanced ESL reading and writing courses (e.g., English 083, and English 093 or 098). The content courses taken by these students carry college credit. Those in beginning or low-intermediate levels are not included in this study. Students enrolled in these courses come from a wide variety of cultural and linguistic backgrounds, and are pursuing different career goals.

THE SETTING

Three transitional content courses and their non-transitional counterparts have been selected for the present study: Psychology 101, Sociology 101, and MRT 105. The average student enrollment in each class is 26. Approximately eight language groups are represented in each course: Cambodian, Chinese, Greek, Hmong, Korean, Portuguese, Spanish, and Vietnamese. Students are not experimentally placed in the various transitional content courses, but have chosen those that best fit their curricula in order to fulfill social science requirements.

Psychology 101 and MRT 105 are taught by monolingual native speakers of English. The Sociology 101 class is taught by a fluent trilingual (English, Spanish, and French), whose first language is Spanish. With the exception of the MRT 105 instructor, the instructors have had experience dealing with foreign-born students. This would be the second time that the MRT 105 instructor has taught non-native speakers of English. Although these instructors are expected to be more tolerant of foreign-born students in terms of repeating and clarifying difficult concepts, they are expected to cover the same material that native speakers of English cover in each of these courses. The Psychology 101 and Sociology 101 classes have been set aside as transitional sections for ESL students. In contrast, 50% of the students in the MRT 105 class are native speakers of English.

Both the Psychology 101 and Sociology 101 instructors teach regular sections of Psychology and Sociology, covering the same material as that presented in the transitional classes, and using departmentally approved mid-term and final exams. Data from these classes on teachers' input, and teacher-student interactions will serve baseline purposes.

The teacher-interlocutor variable will be controlled in order to demonstrate how changes in interlocutor (native speaker-non-native speaker) affect input and interaction in the content classroom. By controlling the teacher-interlocutor in this

manner and changing the student-interlocutor variable, we will be able to examine how the teacher variable varies as a function of change in students' language development.

HYPOTHESES

(1) that there will be more linguistic and interactional adjustments in the transitional than in the regular classroom (Long, 1981, 1985a, 1985b; Gaies, 1983; Chaudron, 1985);

(2) that linguistic and interactional adjustments will affect subjects' comprehension of course content (input) (Pica, Doughty & Young, 1985b) and ESL development (Long, 1983);

(3) that there will be greater gains in ESL through comprehension of transitional and ESL courses than by comprehension of regular and ESL or remedial courses (Peterson, 1985).

ANALYSES OF DATA

Measures of input comprehensibility such as interactional modifications, number and kinds of repetitions, rate of speech, and frequency of input will be identified by examining three videotaped 15-minute segments on comparable topics presented in both the transitional and non-transitional classrooms.

A taxonomy has been developed in order to analyze the hypothesized linguistic input that results from interactional modifications which take place in the classroom (refer to Appendix 1 for a definition of terms involved).

Interrater scales will be used in order to obtain acceptable interrater reliability coefficients.

In order to determine whether or not significant differences exist, and to establish the degree and direction of the hypothesized relationships, appropriate statistical tests will be used following a detailed descriptive analysis of the data presently being collected. Also, in order to correct for the non-randomness of the samples, we will utilize Analyses of Covariance. Other instruments for evaluation of input comprehension and ESL development include listening comprehension and writing tests. Students' records will be examined in order to compare their performance in the transitional content courses with that of the native-English speakers, and of those taking regular content courses and developmental English courses.

POSSIBLE CONFOUNDING FACTORS

Several of the problems to be encountered are related to factors that exist outside the classroom. For example, some of the participating students will probably seek outside help with their homework, do extensive reading on their own, or study with native speakers. It is thus proposed that several measures be developed in order to account for these possible confounds. Writing samples, journals, and test scores from several of the best and worst students in each of these classes will be collected and analyzed. Students will be asked to keep journals describing routine activities performed every day, and to fill out a detailed questionnaire on learning styles and interactional patterns. The ESL specialist assigned to tutor students enrolled in the three transitional classes under investigation will keep track

of students' interactions and learning strategies, and encourage students to record journal entries diligently as part of their required homework. Several students will be selected as case studies in order to investigate the amount of academic writing that they are required to do as part of the course requirements, and that they actually do on their own. Members of one specific ethnic group will be chosen for further study in order to tap into their learning strategies and means of displaying knowledge of content matter.

PRELIMINARY RESULTS

Data were collected for both the Psychology 101 transitional ESL and regular classes during the Spring 1986 semester. Lectures on specific topics at the beginning, middle, and end of the semester were videotaped. The themes chosen for analysis were: "Classical Conditioning," "Punishment," "Learned Helplessness," "Piaget Stages of Development," and "The Executive Monkey's Syndrome."

The following taxonomy was developed in order to code the linguistic data in the transitional and non-transitional classrooms:

Bowers PSYCHOLOGY 101 Title of Segment: Punishment
Duration: 15 minutes

Frames	Rhetorical Questions	Clarification Requests	Clarification Statements
Comprehension Checks Teacher vs. Students	Comprehension Checks Students vs. Teacher	Confirmation Checks Students vs. Teacher	Confirmation Checks Teacher vs. Students
No. of Student Exchanges in Response to Teacher Questions	No. of Student Initiated Exchanges	O.K.'s as Placeholders	O.K.'s used to underscore Sentences
Repetitions of Sentences		Repetitions	- of Concepts - of Directions
Pauses (in seconds) -after each statement -to change a topic		Pauses -after a question	
Cause-Effect Statement		Types of Examples	

(See Appendix 1 for a clarification of the above terms.)

Preliminary analysis of the videotaped lectures reveals that there are subtle linguistic adjustments and interactional modifications that take place in the transitional Psychology 101 class at the levels of discourse structure and content selection. For example, the instructor does not simplify his or her language when addressing students or explaining difficult concepts (e.g., classical conditioning, shaping, learned helplessness, etc.). However, he or she repeats key sentences and words and makes extensive use of rhetorical questions such as "How do you explain that kind of phenomenon?"; "What about our experimental group, though?", which are not followed by pauses. In addition, comprehension checks, immediately followed by six- to ten-second pauses, frequently occur after a detailed explanation: "Makes sense?"; "Why not, then?"; "Do people ever give up and stop trying?"; "Well . . .?" When no feedback is provided by the ESL students, the instructor expands further on the specific topic being covered by providing additional concrete examples: "See this fence here?"

Cause-effect statements are often used by the instructor to clarify relationships that are difficult to envision: "In other words, if you have aggressive parents . . . . . So in a real sense, this should be avoided as much as possible." Clarification statements as opposed to requests seem to play a major role in making input comprehensible for second-language learners: "Some psychologists said it didn't work; in other words, it didn't suppress aggressive behavior"; "Flicker is like a light that goes on and off . . ."

Repetitions of entire sentences, nouns, adverbs and other linguistic features have been observed to occur frequently in the instructor's verbal input to second-language learners: "They were very, very resistant to any kind of learning!"

In the segments analyzed to date ("Punishment" and "Learned Helplessness"), few student-initiated exchanges have been recorded. In other words, student participation is limited. Only two occur in "Learned Helplessness" and one in the "Punishment" section. The exchanges that do occur are generally initiated by the instructor. This means that a one-way interaction predominates in the classroom.

O.K.'s seem to be used primarily for two purposes: as placeholders to retain one's turn in a conversational exchange or speech, and as devices for underscoring important points or topics.

It was also evident that concrete examples are used extensively in clarifying difficult concepts and in rephrasing complex sentences.

The instructor's interaction and delivery in the non-transitional Psychology 101 class (i.e., with native English speakers) differs in some significant respects from the transitional ESL class. For instance, although the rate of delivery does not change substantially, more student-initiated exchanges occur. Teacher-student interactions are longer and livelier than those observed to occur in the ESL transitional classroom. It is important to point out, however, that the instructor makes extensive use of the blackboard in illustrating key concepts in both the non-transitional and transitional classrooms.

Interrater scales are being developed in order to obtain acceptable interrater reliability coefficients. The data will be subjected to statistical analyses upon completion of coding procedures.

LANGUAGE GAINS AND ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

An evaluation of the students' language gains, content mastery, and academic achievement is being conducted in several phases. Instruments for evaluation include mid-term and final-exam grades, linguistic analysis of written pre-tests and post-tests, evaluation of journal entries, grade point averages, and a series of tests of English proficiency and listening comprehension to be administered prior to the start of the course and at the completion of the instructional period.

The average grade obtained by the participating ESL students in the Psychology 101 course was 2.22 (C+), and the average cumulative grade point average (CGPA) for Spring 1986 for the group was 2.63 (N = 18). In terms of background data, the mean age for these students is 23.7 years. Eighty-three percent (83%) of them are high school graduates, while 17% have not completed high school. The class was almost evenly divided between males and females (55% females; 45% males).

The linguistic analyses carried out on the written pre-tests and post-tests, percentage changes in the number of grammatical T-units[1] and S-nodes[2] indicate that students did indeed experience language gains (refer to Table I). A holistic evaluation of their written compositions showed that the majority was at either an 098 (pre-freshman composition level) or at an 093 (advanced ESL) level of writing.

The average final grade in Psychology 101 obtained by the native English speakers was 2.27 (C+), which is comparable to the one obtained by the ESL group. The native English-speaking group attained an averaged GPA of 2.18, considerably lower than the one obtained by the ESL group.

The grade point averages, final grades in regular content courses and in English developmental courses for a group of ESL students not taking either the transitional or advanced ESL reading and writing courses yielded the following results:

- average final grade in regular content course (Psychology 101 non-ESL section), 2.45 or C+;
- average final grade in English developmental course, 3.36 or B+;
- average GPA for ESL students not taking the transitional Psychology 101 course, 2.55 or C+.

These results indicate that students taking both the regular content courses and developmental English courses performed slightly better than those taking the transitional Psychology 101 course and advanced ESL reading and writing courses. However, it is important to point out that these students have passed English 098 and that some are currently taking English 101. In addition, most have been in the U.S. mainland more than four years, whereas the ESL transitional group has been in the U.S. an average of three years.

The preliminary results obtained are encouraging. A relationship appears to exist between language gains, content mastery, and comprehensible input. Second-language proficiency seems to increase as a result of using the second language (English) as an instrument of instruction in academic content areas, rather than as the object of study in a

[1]A T-unit is defined as a principal clause plus all related dependent clauses.

[2]S-nodes are clauses identified by a tensed verb.

language classroom. Data collection for the transitional Sociology 101 and MRT 105 classes will begin in the Fall 1986 semester. Further analyses of the transitional Psychology 101 videotaped lectures will be carried out in the forthcoming months.

LITERATURE CITED

Chaudron, C. (1983). Foreigner talk in the classroom—an aid to learning? In H. W. Seliger & M. H. Long (Eds.), *Classroom oriented research in second language acquisition*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House Publishers, Inc.

Chaudron, C. (1985). A method for examining the input/intake distinction. In S. M. Gass & C. G. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House Publishers, Inc.

Gaies, S. (1983). Learner feedback: An exploratory study of its role in the second language classroom. In H. W. Seliger & M. H. Long (Eds.), *Classroom oriented research in second language acquisition*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House Publishers, Inc.

Genessee, F. (1983). Bilingual education of majority language children: The immersion experiments in review. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 4(1), 1-46.

Long, M. H. (1981). Input, interaction, and second language acquisition. In H. Winitz (Ed.), *Native language and foreign language acquisition* (pp. 259-278). New York: Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences 379.

Long, M. H. (1985a). Input and second language acquisition theory. In S. M. Gass & C. G. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House Publishers, Inc.

Long, M. H. (1985b). Instructed interlanguage development. In L. Beebe (Ed.), *Issues in second language acquisition: multiple perspectives*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House Publishers, Inc.

Long, M. H., & Sato, C. (1983). Classroom foreigner talk discourse and functions of teachers' questions. In H. W. Seliger & M. H. Long (Eds.), *Classroom oriented research in second language acquisition*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House Publishers, Inc.

Peterson, P. W. (1985). The bridge course: Listening comprehension in authentic settings. *TESOL Newsletter, XIX*, Washington, DC.

Pica, T., Doughty, C., & Young, R. (1985b). *Making input comprehensible: Do interactional modifications help?* Paper presented at the 1985 TESOL Summer Meeting, Georgetown University, Washington, DC.

Stern, H. (1981). Communicative language teaching and learning: Toward a synthesis. In H. Altman & J. Alatis (Eds.), *The second language classroom: Directions for the 1980s'*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (1981) *Bilingual education: A decade of research*. Toronto: Ontario Ministry of Education.

Swain, M. (1984). A review of immersion education in Canada: Research and evaluation studies. *Studies on immersion; A collection for United States educators*. Sacramento, CA: California State Department of Education.

Wesche, M. B., & Ready, D. (1985). Foreigner talk in the university classroom. In S. M. Gass & C. G. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House Publishers, Inc.

Nancy Sander, Steve Jones, and John Plato spent long hours helping analyze the data. Special thanks is extended to Dr. Donald Bowers, Associate Professor in Psychology, for his kindness and patience in allowing us to videotape his Psychology 101 classes.

APPENDIX 1

The following are definitions of terms used in the Taxonomy developed for analyzing linguistic features and interactional patterns:

Clarification Statements

Moves by which one speaker (the instructor in our case) provides further elaboration of a preceding utterance, such as in:

Teacher	Students
"But if punishment is used in excess it could produce side effects; let me explain . . ."	

(It is important to point out that the students participating in the Psychology 101 transitional class were primarily Indochinese.)

Clarification Requests

Moves by which one speaker seeks assistance in understanding the other speaker's preceding utterance through questions (including wh-, yes-no, rising intonation, or tag), or statements such as "I don't understand":

Teacher	Students
"And these people constitute an underclass."	"What's an underclass?"

Confirmation Checks

Moves by which one speaker seeks confirmation of the other's preceding message through repetition, with rising intonation, of all or part of the message.

Teacher	Students
"Rats become aggressive after electrical shocks."	
	"Electrical shocks?"
"Mary has claustrophobia."	
	"Claustrophobia?"

Comprehension Checks

Moves through which one speaker (usually the instructor in the ESL transitional class under investigation) attempts to determine whether the other speaker has understood a preceding message or utterance.

Teacher	Students
"What would happen if the dog received a shock after eating raw meat?"	
"What would you do if you were a dog?"	

Frames

Linguistic devices, such as opening statements or utterances used to get the attention of students: "Any dog lovers?" "Any dog haters?" These devices are also used to frame examples: "Let me explain it a bit longer. First, there's the connection between punishment and aggression." (Two-second pause.) "Then . . ."

O.K.'s

These are used primarily for two purposes: as placeholders to retain one's turn in a conversational exchange, or as devices for underscoring important points.

Cause-Effect Statements

These devices are often used by the instructor to clarify relationships that are difficult to envision: "In other words, if you have aggressive parents. . . So in a real sense, this should be avoided as much as possible."

TABLE I

Results of Linguistic Analyses Conducted of Students Pre- and Post-Tests

Student No.	Pre-Test: Total T-Units	Pre-Test: No. of Grammatical T-Units	Pre-Test: Total S-Nodes	Pre-Test: No. of Grammatical S-Nodes	Post-Test: Total T-Units	Post-Test: No. of Grammatical T-Units	Post-Test: Total S-Nodes	Post-Test: No. of Grammatical S-Nodes
1	5	11	1	7	13	6 (+ 5) (+500%)	28	14 (+ 7) (+100%)
2	6	0	8	2	13	4 (+ 4) (+400% ∞)*	17	7 (+ 5) (+250%)
3	8	4	12	5	16	12 (+ 8) (+200%)	28	24 (+19) (+380%)
4	8	0	11	0	11	1 (+ 1) (+100% ∞)*	17	2 (+ 2) (+200%)
5	8	1	17	8	15	5 (+ 4) (+400%)	21	11 (+ 3) (+ 38%)
6	7	1	11	5	30	13 (+12) (+1200%)	56	28 (+23) (+460%)
7	6	1	6	1				
8	6	1	10	6	9	0 (- 1) (-100% ∞)*	22	8 (+ 2) (+ 33%)
9	5	1	6	2	8	2 (+ 1) (+100%)	12	5 (+ 2) (+150%)
10	8	2	14	7				
11	9	5	13	7	17	5 (0) (0%)	24	11 (+ 4) (+ 57%)
12	9	4	14	8	16	7 (+ 3) (+ 75%)	28	15 (+ 7) (+ 88%)
13								
14	7	3	10	7	19	7 (+ 4) (+133%)	28	13
15	6	5	8	7				
16	8	1	14	5	15	1 (0) (0%)	20	5 (0%) (0%)
17								
18	6	4	12	8	13	5 (+ 1) (+ 25%)	23	15 (+ 7) (+ 88%)
19	4	4	7	7	11	6 (+ 2) (+ 50%)	18	11 (+ 4) (+ 57%)
20	10	4	12	5				

* ∞ = Indefinitely greater (infinity)

ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE FOR JUNIOR COLLEGES
OCT 12 1990